DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 126 UD 024 457

TITLE	Desegregation and Bilingual Education--Partners in Quality Education. Conference Proceedings (San Diego, California, April 2-3, 1981).
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Bureau of Adult Education.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Sales, California State Department of Education, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95802 ($4.25).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Bilingual Education Programs; Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Litigation; *Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Ethnic Bias; Federal Programs; *Hispanic Americans; *Program Effectiveness; School Desegregation; State Departments of Education; *State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	California; Status Equalization

ABSTRACT

This booklet presents the proceedings of a conference on the relationship between bilingual education and desegregation in California. The topics covered by the speakers at the general session were: (1) Desegregation and Bilingual Education: A National Perspective; (2) Legal Requirements Related to Desegregation and Bilingual Education; (3) Role of State Leadership in Achieving Partnership Between Desegregation and Bilingual Education; (4) Assistance Available to Local Educational Agencies; and (5) Citizens Who Can Function Effectively. These speeches were followed by six work sessions. The first gave four minority viewpoints on the problem of desegregation and bilingual education in the participants' individual communities. The second was on how to build a support system for bilingual education in an integrated school system, focusing on case study examples and emphasizing the need for status equalization between students with different ethnic and language backgrounds. The third session was on the observations of one speaker who had toured the country examining different desegregation and language assistance programs. Three examples are given of programs the speaker found effective. In the fourth session the speaker discusses what California children are entitled to and what they receive in terms of equal access to equal education. The fifth session concerns the factors that positively and negatively affect desegregation and bilingual education programs. The sixth concerns convincing parents, principals and the community of the value of an integrated education. (CG)

Conference Proceedings

Desegregation and Bilingual Education—Partners in Quality Education

ED262126

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Smith

CA State Dept of Ed. Sacramento

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EFF 61 (6/80)

UD 023457

CALIFORNIA STATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bill Honig—Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sacramento, 1983

Conference Proceedings

Desegregation and Bilingual Education—Partners in Quality Education

Compiled by the
Office of Intergroup Relations
California State Department of Education

Publishing Information

This publication, which was compiled by the Office of Intergroup Relations, was edited and prepared for photo-offset production by the Bureau of Publications, California State Department of Education, and was published by the Department, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Printed by the Office of State Printing and distributed under the provisions of the Library Distribution Act

1983

Copies of this publication are available for $4.25 each, plus sales tax for California residents, from Publications Sales, California State Department of Education, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95802.

A partial list of other publications available from the Department can be found on page 48 of this publication.

CONTENTS

Page

Preface v

General Sessions

1. Desegregation and Bilingual Education: A National Perspective 1
   Shirley McCune, Keynote Speaker 1
2. Legal Requirements Related to Desegregation and Bilingual Education 7
   Paul Grossman, First Speaker 7
   Thomas M. Griffin, Second Speaker 11
   John Graham, Third Speaker 14
   John McLevie, Fourth Speaker 15
3. Role of State Leadership in Achieving Partnership Between Desegregation and Bilingual Education 17
   Benjamin Williams, Keynote Speaker 17
4. Assistance Available to Local Educational Agencies 20
   Mary McDonald, First Speaker 20
   Juan Hurtado, Second Speaker 21
   Daniel Holt, Third Speaker 21
   Ples Griffin, Fourth Speaker 22
5. Citizens Who Can Function Effectively 25
   Lorenza Calvillo-Craig, Keynote Speaker 25

Work Sessions

1. Minority Views 28
   Minta Brown, Moderator 28
   Annie Richardson, Participant 28
   Herlinda Ramirez, Participant 29
   Toti de Guzman, Participant 29
2. Building a Support System for Bilingual Education Within an Integrated School 31
   Daniel Holt, Mario Muniz, and Maria Vasquez, Participants 31
3. Building Programs That Work 36
   Patricia Gandara, Moderator 36
4. California: The Reality 40
   Alberto Ochoa, Moderator 40
5. What Hurts and What Helps 42
   Nicelma King, Moderator 42
6. It Can Happen 47
   Teretta Terrell, Moderator 47

PREFACE

When we discuss integration and bilingual education, we are, in effect, looking at two different but valid definitions of equality. The National Task Force on Desegregation Strategies concluded after a three-year study that a productive, enriching, and legally feasible interface between bilingual education and desegregation can be achieved.

A conference entitled "Desegregation and Bilingual Education—Partners in Quality Education" was presented by the Office of Intergroup Relations, California State Department of Education, on April 2-3, 1981, in San Diego, California. This publication contains the presentations made by speakers, panelists, and workshop leaders and reflects their thinking on the subject of desegregation and bilingual education.

The goal of this conference was to provide a greater understanding of the relationship between school desegregation and bilingual education in California.

Cochairpersons of the conference planning committee were Reuben Burton, Assistant Chief in the Office of Intergroup Relations, and Maria Rosa Grunwaldt, Director, Berkeley Bilingual Consortium. Special thanks are due to the chairpersons and members of the committee for their time, energy, and commitment to making the conference a productive one. Other members of the committee were:

Stuart Bernstein, Director, Integration Planning/Management, Los Angeles Unified School District

Ramon Cruz, Talent Search, California State University, Long Beach

John Graham, Professor of Education, California State University, Long Beach

Nicelma King, Researcher, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica

Mary Martin, Consultant, Compensatory and Intergroup Programs, Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools

Maria Matute-Bianchi, University of California, Santa Cruz

Mary McDonald, Director, Lau Center, Oakland

Mario Muniz, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education

Consuelo Nieto, School of Education, California State University, Long Beach

Albert Ochoa, Director, National Origin Desegregation Lau Center, San Diego State University

Greta Pruitt, Coordinator, Compensatory Education Operation, Los Angeles Unified School District

JAMES R. SMITH
Deputy Superintendent for Curriculum and Instructional Leadership

PLES GRIFFIN
Chief, Office of Intergroup Relations

GENERAL SESSION ONE

DESEGREGATION AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION: A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Keynote Speaker:

Shirley McCune, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Equal Educational Opportunity Program, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.*

It is a real pleasure for me to be here with you today. Unfortunately, the atmosphere is not exactly as pleasant as I would like it to be for support of the issues which are being considered. I think it is time for some very serious consideration of not only the questions of desegregation and bilingual education but also the question of the future of education in our country. We have another issue involving whether private or public schools can better serve the needs of racial integration and the quality of education.

Most of you in the audience are aware that something very profound is going on in our society today. We are at a watershed. There is an apparent shift of power from the federal to state and local governments. Along with the shift in power will come greater responsibilities for local leaders and profound changes for those of us who support any of the equity issues.

All of you know, I am sure, that a proposal has been made for changing the funding of equity issues and moving them into block grants. I do not intend to deal with the pros and cons of block grants. But it is apparent that if block grants are enacted for the funding of equity issues, each of us is going to have to assume a much greater responsibility for ensuring that funds are used to carry out our goals. We will have to provide our own leadership and learn to work efficiently with those around us.

Perhaps one of the best things we could do at this time is to try to understand what has happened in our society. Much of the glue that traditionally held us together and served us well has at least weakened, if not dissolved totally. We have been a very prosperous country. Although we are a small portion of the world's population, we consume a large portion of its resources. We are a country that has been blessed in many ways, but I think we are seeing a time when we are going to have to choose our priorities in a different way.

*Names, titles, and locations of conference participants were those in effect when this publication was being compiled.

All of us would affirm the need for dealing with the economic issues of our society and for making sure that our society continues strong and healthy. But my great concern at this time is that we do not forget that our human resources, and particularly our children, are the most important things.

It would be a mistake to approach the next few years by dismantling programs that, in fact, are essential for our survival. I think that it is essential that we have a strong, healthy school system. Each of us must make sure to accept the responsibility for giving greater support to equity programs everywhere and to protect the progress that has been made.

How do we do that? How do bilingual education and desegregation fit into the larger educational issues? Perhaps the only thing we can count on in the future is change. That is the thing that will continue to be with us, and we see it in the areas of desegregation and bilingual education. The meanings of the very words have evolved over a period of time, and the advocacy groups for those two movements have evolved over a period of time. At this point we need to determine where we have mutual interests, how we can capitalize on the things that we agree on, and how we can build a sufficient power base to protect the things that are most important to all of us.

We are a country that has been blessed in many ways, but I think we are seeing a time when we are going to have to choose our priorities in a different way.

I would like to deal with three questions. First, what are our mutual, overriding goals? Second, what in the evolution of desegregation led to what is perceived to be a split between bilingual education and desegregation? And third, what do we need to do to ensure that our mutual interests are served?

Let me start with the question of our goals. Several years ago a researcher in Oklahoma did a series of

studies on how to get groups to work together. Basically, he found that the way you present a task to a group, the way you structure groups, and the amount of contact the groups have with one another are very important. But the primary factor in ensuring that groups learn to work together is that they see cooperation as being in their own interests. We must understand that it is in our own interest to work with others because we all depend on one another, not only economically but politically and socially.

With that in mind, perhaps we could think about desegregation in a way that I think we are going to have to use as a selling point for desegregation and for bilingual education. I believe it is very difficult to sell people on busing just for the sake of busing, even

We must understand that it is in our own interest to work with others because we all depend on one another, not only economically but politically and socially.

though I might be able to put together some arguments for that. And it is very difficult to sell people on the need for bilingual education when it is not perceived to be in their own interests. In fact, it may be perceived as being threatening.

It seems to me that the rhetoric we need to adopt for our purposes is that of quality education. Unfortunately, we have usually equated quality education with high academic standards. Now, that is a part of quality education, and it is a very important part; but it is not the only part. My definition of quality education is one that we truly prepare people for effective living as adults in our society. Quality education, then, would include not only the preparation of children in terms of basic skills, language acquisition (bilingual acquisition for all students we would hope), mathematics, the sciences, all the things we traditionally think of as part of the academic curriculum, but also preparation for participation in the world of work. Schools continue to channel minorities and females into traditional roles through career counseling and training programs. Social equality is not possible without economic equality. So work preparation is a part of quality education.

A third and tremendously important part of quality education is providing students with respect for themselves so that they feel worthwhile, continue to grow and contribute to our society, and are expected to do so.

A fourth ingredient of quality education is that students are exposed to people who are different. Most of us feel safer with people who are like us, and we tend to organize our lives so that we deal only with people who are like us. We live in neighborhoods by income levels. We go to church with people who are like us. We see people who are like us in our professional associations. That serves some of our basic needs, but the truth is we learn from people who are different. What we have to do is to instill our children and ourselves with enough confidence and security that we can move beyond our basic safety needs.

Another part of quality education is an understanding of the history and the contributions of all groups in our society. I have spent a great deal of time examining textbooks for omissions of the history of various groups of Americans and for the stereotypes that continue to be used in those textbooks. We have to deal with these basic issues in the revision of our curriculum.

Finally, we know that quality education can occur only when people have actual hands-on opportunities for interacting, working, and learning to live with people who are different from themselves.

Now if we apply this expanded definition of quality education, it becomes clear that some of the traditional approaches to education need to be changed. In terms of desegregation, the mutual goals can be found in going back to the 1955 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka,* a landmark case that everyone in our field remembers. It is interesting that relatively few people remember that the issue of segregating Hispanics was addressed about three years prior to that in a court case in Texas. Although the case resulted in a decision that Hispanics could not be segregated even though they had been subjected to a hundred years of segregationist practices in the United States, it was not until three

. . . Quality education can occur only when people have actual hands-on opportunities for interacting, working, and learning to live with people who are different from themselves.

years later, when *Brown* was decided, that the decision was implemented and Hispanic groups were included in the right to attend public school and receive education in an integrated setting.

We all remember the efforts to dismantle the dual system in southern states, and we remember the concepts and the words of the dual systems. We forget

some of the lessons that we learned in that process. If you go back and read the legislative history of 1964, you will find a romantic, rather naive belief that we were all a part of the belief that if we simply put black children and white children in the same classroom, somehow we would end up with an integrated school system. About ten years passed before we understood that the dual systems did not disappear when black and white children are put in the same school. We learned that dual systems are maintained in the expectations of teachers and administrators. They are maintained in differential treatment of students, and they are maintained in differential curriculum, differential reinforcement of students, and differential provision of role models. Now, it was on that basis for black-white desegregation that we began to understand the issues that are involved in the treatment of Asians, Hispanics, Native Americans, and females. It was in that experience that we began to understand the subtleties of integration, and we began to change our understanding of the word *desegregation*. Unfortunately, some of the programs I work with today still depend on a fairly narrow definition of desegregation,

> ***. . . Learning goes on in both directions. So it is important that we provide the maximum amount of interracial contact possible.***

meaning physical desegregation of students. But I would like to state for you what I think desegregation really means. I think it is sufficiently broad and general that it includes the issue of bilingual education and many of the other issues we are going to have to deal with.

I would say that there are levels of desegregation and that each level has different goals. The first and in some ways the easiest part—believe it or not for those of you from Los Angeles—is physical desegregation. Now this may sound like a very artificial kind of thing to some people, but the primary purpose of physical desegregation is to ensure interracial contact.

It is important for students to have a variety of peers with whom they can interact because they will learn different things from different groups. By the way, I think we tend to overlook the two-way nature of interaction; learning goes on in both directions. So it is important that we provide the maximum amount of interracial contact possible.

The second level of desegregation is based on the structure that is provided in Title VI and in case law. At this level we face what I term the access issues. Clearly, one of the issues in bilingual education is that of access. An integrated classroom is impossible if there are children who need bilingual services and do not receive them. It would be nice to think that at some point in our history we will believe that all students need bilingual education. But the access issues include not only the language but the right to enroll in certain programs. Without mentioning any districts in California, in a recent application for Emergency School Aid funds, I was appalled to find that the location of vocational schools in that community led to a very clear pattern of denial of access of vocational education courses to both blacks and Hispanics. Those are the kinds of situations that we have to continue to deal with.

The third level of desegregation is the one closest to my heart and the one that I happen to think is the most important—the interaction between the child and the adults in the school. I am talking about both administrators and teachers. Ultimately, equality and equal education are determined by the relationship the child has with the teacher and the principal in the school. It is in the day-to-day interactions that children learn not only what is in the curriculum but how an adult sees them, and what an adult expects of them. We need a tremendous amount of work in understanding different cultures and developing the skills to ensure that children are actually treated in terms of their individual needs rather than our expectations and our stereotypes about their needs.

The next level of desegregation involves the curriculum. The curriculum must be expanded to include multicultural aspects. This level includes not only correcting the stereotypes and omissions of today's curriculum but also expanding the curriculum so that the needs of all children and all groups—whether they are Hispanics, blacks, Asians, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, or Western European—are all considered in the curriculum.

Finally, there is the issue of role modeling, an extremely important issue. I was just looking at some of the school statistics for California. About 25 percent of the students are from Hispanic backgrounds, but only about 6 percent of the teachers and the administrators are Hispanic. I do not have the data for black children or Asian children, but I could guess that there are some discrepancies in those areas. A child who does not see someone like himself or herself in an adult role has a great deal of difficulty aspiring to that role. As you may know, Hispanics have the highest dropout rate among all groups in the nation's schools. I think it is related to the fact that they do not

have adults in schools who understand them and appreciate their cultural background. It is true for black children, Pacific Islanders, Asians, or any other group.

If we analyze my broadened definition of desegregation, we find goals that include the interests of all groups. We are really talking about improving the quality of education in public schools, and this may be the rhetoric needed in the future to gain the support and understanding needed to continue working toward the goals we have concentrated on in terms of equity.

Now we come to the question of how we got to this point in desegregation and what is really happening. Even though we have to change, how can we maintain the gains that have been made? Early desegregation studies were not very encouraging. However, I think there has been a tremendous lack of attention given to recent studies. These studies are much more encouraging—at least to me. If we look just at the issue of physical integration of students, we have seen progress made, particularly in the southern states, for black students. And with that progress has come the very encouraging information that the academic achievement of black students in the southern states is running ahead of that in other areas of the country. The results suggest that the funds that have been spent and the efforts that have been made for racial desegregation in the South are paying off. Some of the academic goals are being achieved.

Despite this progress we still have tremendous problems in the schooling of black children. Forty percent of the black students in the United States today go to schools in which 90 percent to 100 percent of the students in a classroom are minority children.

A child who does not see someone like himself or herself in an adult role has a great deal of difficulty aspiring to that role.

If we look at the case of Hispanics, the problem becomes even more obvious. The segregation of Hispanics has surpassed the segregation of black students in every section of the country. This fact has been attributed in part to the geographic concentrations of Hispanics and in part to a trade-off of goals. Some of the litigation involving desegregation has included a conscious determination by Mexican-American groups not to join in court suits at the early stages but participate later as intervenors. As you know, in any desegregation court case, the first part of the case is usually concerned with whether there in fact has been discrimination. The second part addresses the issue of how to remediate the discrimination. It is in that second stage that Hispanic groups, particularly Mexican-Americans, have been involved. The remedies have been quite limited in one sense; they have focused on bilingual education. But because the Hispanic groups were not involved in the first stages of litigation, they were not involved in the issues of reassignment of pupils. I think this condition was true in California in a number of cases in which the difficulties of trying to take care of all the racially isolated schools have plagued us as we have tried to deal with desegregation plans.

The "National Study of Hispanics in Desegregation" was conducted by the Latino Institute. It was completed, I believe, in 1978, and it is the most recent major assessment of what desegregation has actually done. One of the findings of that study, as I have mentioned, is that blacks are more segregated than Hispanics between schools and across schools but that the segregation of blacks has decreased more than the segregation of Hispanic students. Some evidence suggests that desegregation of black students has in fact had something to do with the increased segregation of Hispanic students, because many of the desegregation plans have dealt with only two races rather than from a multiethnic perspective.

Another finding of the study is that limited Hispanic community participation and acceptance of desegregation plans is frequently a problem; but it has been overcome in cases in which there has been a consistent effort to involve the community to ensure an understanding of the plan. Desegregation cannot happen effectively or be an effective tool for all groups without the real involvement of the community. Hispanic groups have resisted court-ordered desegregation plans, because the plans tend to disperse Chicano or Mexican-American or Hispanic students so that they are no longer eligible for bilingual education or early childhood education services. In fact, desegregation has often been implemented to the direct disadvantage of Hispanic groups.

Another finding of the study was that racially balanced student assignments resulted in positive outcomes for Hispanics, in that the district moved to improve facilities and curriculum. In situations where there has been an attempt to achieve real racial balance in schools, districts have responded by improving the total curriculum and facilities that were ignored before.

Another thing that was pointed out in the study is that the majority-dominated districts may support bi-

lingual education but not for the same reasons as the Hispanic community or the Asian community. It may be supported simply as a way of maintaining segregated Hispanic or Asian schools, for example. So we have pressures on both sides. It is important that you support bilingual education, but your motive for supporting it may need to be understood.

The conclusion of the study was that desegregation did not appear to harm the interests of any group of students if it was implemented in an understanding fashion. Now that is the big IF. No group necessarily loses in the implementation of a desegregation plan, particularly if the plan is comprehensive, dealing not only with physical desegregation but with curriculum, staffing, and the training of teachers and administrators.

The question we have to ask ourselves now is, What can we do in our future desegregation efforts? Whether we call them desegregation efforts or something else, it seems to me that we have learned some lessons from the past that we can apply in the future. It is important that each of us applies them because these decisions will be more and more the decisions of local leadership.

The first thing we learned was that school desegregation plans should carefully distinguish the needs of blacks, the needs of Hispanics, the needs of Asians, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders—every group in the community. The common needs and the differential needs of groups in the community must be taken into account in the development of a plan.

A second thing we have found is that desegregation plans must adhere to existing state and federal guidelines for bilingual education. Every attempt should be made to avoid the dispersal of limited- and non-English-speaking students to make sure that it is economically feasible to provide necessary services and to make sure that the students' opportunities are not limited.

Again, it is critical that attention be given to the issue of role modeling. There has been a tendency for Hispanic children involved in desegregation not to come into contact with supportive role models. Providing such role models implies the hiring of additional staff rather than simply desegregating or breaking up the Hispanic staff. That can be done if there is a much closer balance between the characteristics of the population of students and the characteristics of the population of staff.

Desegregation efforts must include both real community-parent involvement programs and extensive retraining and resocialization of staff. There can be no such thing as an effective desegregation plan without intensive staff development. There is not enough of what I call systematic or sequential staff development in which teachers and administrators learn the skills and the techniques that are essential not only for affirmative action but for what I call affirmative education.

Desegregation cannot happen effectively or be an effective tool for all groups without the real involvement of the community.

The success of any social movement—and I do think that educational equity is one of the most important social movements of our time and will continue to be an important movement—depends on three components: a vision of where we are going; mechanisms of hope to keep people moving and motivated toward that vision; and the empowerment of people to work for that vision.

I would like to suggest that we have a common vision. The vision we have is that our children are one of our most important resources and that we all have a responsibility for children. Whether or not they are our children biologically, they are in fact our precious commodity, and our future depends on them. Our individual differences can be resolved if we understand that it is in our enlightened self-interest to work for that vision.

We also have a vision of a society that is different. The United States is a great social experiment. It still remains probably the world's most diversely populated country that has attempted to build on diversity as an asset. The benefits of this approach have been realized in many ways. But we also have to understand the inherent problems. Our vision is to make sure that it works, that we truly affirm the dignity of the individual, and that we truly build a society in which all contributions can be recognized and accepted.

I also think it is important to realize that we are going to need to work on mechanisms of hope in the future. I do not think that the years ahead are going to be easy. One of the things we need to do more of is "networking." We continue to look to people who are like us for networking, but what we have to learn to do now is to go out to groups that are harder to talk to. We must talk to the groups that have traditionally been opposed to the goals that we espouse. Networking must be not only a support for us but also a form of advocacy.

Basically, the function of education is empowerment. Paolo Frere always says there is nothing so

truly revolutionary as education. It is revolutionary in the sense that it gives people the power to act in their own behalf, and that is exactly what is needed for all minority groups. It is needed for all human beings.

We must make sure that in education we do not simply perpetuate the status quo but also foster social change. We are preparing children to live in a society that is different from the one existing now. It is one which we have hopes for, one for which we have dreams that things will be better. Perhaps it is in times of adversity that we find our greatest strengths. It is in times of adversity that we begin to appreciate what is really important in our lives. During the next few years, we may find out whether or not we do have those strengths.

GENERAL SESSION TWO

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO DESEGREGATION AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION

First Speaker

Paul Grossman, Attorney, Office for Civil Rights, Region IX, U.S. Department of Education

I am going to discuss the legal roots of the topic of this conference. I have to say that I am going to make legal interpretations with which lawyers and educators can honestly disagree. Disagreement also occurs, I am sure, within the state government, within the federal government, and among educators. I am presenting my understanding of the law. I will do my best to be consistent with what I understand to be the interpretations of the federal government, but I would not pretend that there is only one opinion or one interpretation of any of these issues.

The thesis that I would like to develop with you is based on historical inevitability. When we discuss integration and bilingual education, we are, in effect, looking at two different but valid definitions of equality. It is also my belief that these two views of equality can, should, and must be harmonized. I would like to discuss mostly the view of equality that has arisen around bilingual education. My colleague, Tom Griffin, I think, will discuss the definition of equality that has arisen in the area of integration.

Thirty-five years ago, eight years before *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* (347 U.S. 483 [1955]), which is the landmark case concerning integration, in a case concerning the Westminster School District, a federal court held for the first time that the maintenance of separate schools for various races violates the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, something to be said by the *Brown* court much later. The case did not concern the Deep South. It concerned Orange County, California, and the students involved were not black students; they were brown students. So when we start with the early civil rights history, particularly in the Far West, the courts were first concerned with the fact that a student's language was used by school districts as an excuse for separating students because of their race.

Defendants in the Westminster case convinced the federal court that the quality of instruction that the Hispanic students received, which was justified on the basis of the fact that they did not speak English, was of the same quality as that received in the Anglo schools. The court still found it illegal because it was the intention, the purpose, or the objective of the school district to use this seeming educational rationale to separate children and to discriminate against them. So when we start historically, we have to understand that the courts perhaps are suspicious of saying that non- and limited-English-speaking students should be separated to give them an equal educational opportunity.

Thus, the first time the issue of special needs of non- or limited-English-speaking students was considered, the court found that separate education cannot be equal education. And that is the first view of equality, the view of equality that was carried on in the *Brown* case.

When we discuss integration and bilingual education, we are, in effect, looking at two different but valid definitions of equality.

Several years later, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (now divided into the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education) issued regulations to implement Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI is what I call a "one-liner." It in effect says that you shall not discriminate on the basis of race or national origin against beneficiaries of federal programs. And in this case we are talking about federal educational programs. Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the authority to issue laws to effect that civil rights principle. Congress, in turn, in Section 201 of Title VI, gave HEW the responsibility for explaining that one-liner, and that is how the regulations were developed. As required, HEW issued regulations, and I would like to highlight just a few sections of those regulations:

- Section 80.3(a) states, "No persons shall be excluded from participation in a federal-funded

program on the basis of national origin." So, right there, you see that what we are looking at is children having access to or getting involved in whatever program the federal recipient, the school district, is providing.

- Section 80.3(b)(2) (and I want to be clear that this long predates the *Lau* v. *Nichols* (414 U.S. 563 [1974]) decision) states that recipients may not operate their educational program using methods that have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of national origin. If that sounds like a lot of gobbledygook, what it [the court] is trying to say is that, irrespective of a district's intention, if it [a district] adopts programmatic approaches that turn out to hurt children because of their national origin, then it [the district] is violating Title VI.
- Section 80.3(b)(4) states, "No person shall be denied a benefit under the program enjoyed by others on account of national origin." So we are looking at the notion that Anglo children, for example, are receiving benefits under an educational program and so, too, ought all children, irrespective of race or national origin.

In May, 1979, HEW for the first time attempted to define more specifically the Title VI regulations. The department came to realize that the general definitions needed clarification with respect to children who were limited-English proficient or, as we say, non- or limited-English speaking. And again, I think, concerns about segregation occurred in a May 25, 1970, memorandum in which the department said, "Any ability grouping or tracking system employed by a school district to deal with special language-skill needs of national-origin-minority-group children must be designed to meet such skill needs as soon as possible and must not operate as an educational dead end or permanent track." So HEW was beginning to stake out its position, which was that children can be separated to the extent it is necessary to give them their equal educational opportunity, but it must not be a permanent separation. School districts must also be alert to ensure that they can achieve equal access and integration at the same time. The same memorandum continued with words that you have probably heard time and time again at *Lau* conferences, because they were adopted by the U.S. Supreme Court as its rationale in the *Lau* decision.

The memorandum stated, "Where the inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national-origin-group children from effective participation in an educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students." This statement represented an important change in the definition of equality because what it told districts was that identical treatment is not necessarily equal treatment. It meant that districts, at least with respect to non- or limited-English-speaking children, have to do something affirmative. This is a notion of equality that is very different from the notions of equality first set forth in the *Brown* decision. These principles were tested rigorously in the landmark *Lau* case.

School districts must also be alert to ensure that they can achieve equal access and integration at the same time.

As you probably all know, *Lau* involved about 3,000 Chinese children in the San Fransisco Unified School District. About 1,000 of the children received some special services; about 2,000 children received the same education as all other children. In the district court and in the appellate court, the first and second levels in the judicial system, it was argued that this unequal treatment was a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. That argument did not succeed. The Supreme Court in effect ducked the issue and said that HEW, under Title VI, was empowered to look at the problems of these children, decide how to give them equal educational opportunity, and then define what school districts must do. So, in a narrow sense, what the court did was simply to say that the definition of equality adopted by HEW was within its authority and that it was a reasonable and constitutionally permissible interpretation of Title VI.

However, I think there is a more important point to come out of that case. The court accepted the notion that identical treatment is not necessarily equal treatment and that school districts may have to do something affirmative to give children equal treatment. The court in effect came up with a number of principles that I think will last forever, despite all the conflict and despite all the questions about bilingual education. First of all, Title VI protects national-origin-minority children. Second, when a district discriminates against children because of their language, it is discriminating against them because of their national origin. That is how we get the hook; that is how we get jurisdiction over the issue of language-minority children. To try to provide these children equal educa-

tional opportunity merely by treating them the same as their peers is untenable. The court said there is no equality of treatment merely by providing children with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum, because students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education. Third, the imposition of the requirement that a child must already know English before he or she can participate in an educational program is to make a mockery of public education.

I would like to clarify some myths about the *Lau* decision because I think it is good to have a legal foundation for discussions of the issues to be raised in this conference. First of all, the *Lau* decision did not reach the issue of whether or not bilingual education is required under the Title VI. The court was not asked to reach that issue. When the case was remanded to the local federal court for fashioning of a remedy, a bilingual education program was created, but *Lau* does not require bilingual education. It is my personal view, a view which I have urged on the Department of Education, that bilingual education is the most logical fulfillment of the principles of *Lau*. The reasons I say that are, first, that most of the courts that filed the *Lau* decision did order bilingual education and, second, if we logically think about the *Lau* decision, what other than bilingual education does not create English as a prerequisite for equal and effective participation in the instruction provided by a school district?

Let me go on to a few of the minor myths of *Lau*. I have heard many school districts say *Lau* is only about children who speak no English. That is not correct. The *Lau* decision says that it is about children who speak little or no English. More precisely, it is about children who are denied effective participation because of their language ability. Where effective participation begins and ends is what the *Lau* decision is about. The second thing I hear school districts say is the *Lau* decision applies only to large groups of children. That misconception is based on the concurring opinion of Justice Blackman, who said exactly those words. However, the majority opinion and the language of Title VI itself, which says "no person," do not refer to people who are members of large minority groups or people who are there in large numbers. Title VI states that no person shall be denied equal educational opportunity. That does not mean that as a matter of common sense and equity we do not have to make compromises, that we do not have to solve problems involving very small groups of children. The level of feasibility for the various group sizes is not always the same, but I think we have to be very careful that the bottom line is that no child may be denied his or her rights.

The level of feasibility for the various group sizes is not always the same, but I think we have to be very careful that the bottom line is that no child may be denied his or her rights.

I want to talk to you very briefly about some cases that followed the *Lau* decision. Much of the controversy in this area has been about whether bilingual education is a required remedy. The thesis I have continued to develop is that, although *Lau* did not require it, bilingual education is the logical extension of *Lau*.

In *United States* v. *Texas*, which, as Shirley McCune mentions in her address, occurred before the *Lau* decision, bilingual education was required to preserve the feasibility of a desegregation order in the state of Texas. So, in some sense, the first federal court to order bilingual education did so because it saw it as a necessary element of successfully achieving desegregation. We can see from the very beginning that desegregation and bilingual education are seen by some federal courts to go hand in hand.

In subsequent cases this notion has continued to develop. In several cases—*Serna* v. *Bertalis*, *Espaira* v. *New York*, *Cintron* v. *Brentwood*, and *Rios* v. *Reed*—the plaintiffs wanted the courts to rule that bilingual education is a right, and that is what the courts held. It is interesting to note, though, that in some of the more recent cases—*Cintron* v. *Brentwood* and *Rios* v. *Reed*, for example—the court continued to look over its shoulder at the issue of the separation of children to achieve a bilingual program. Again and again the courts decided that districts cannot use bilingual education as an excuse for separating children. In other words, children should not be isolated all day in bilingual education programs. Students should be moved to the standard program as soon as they are capable.

I want to be very clear. I am not talking about the issue of maintenance bilingual education, if maintenance bilingual education simply means that, after children are fluent in English, they still spend part of the day developing their native language skills. I see nothing conflicting with the principle being discussed. If maintenance bilingual education means, as it did in the *Cintron* case, keeping children isolated all day for all eight years of their basic education, then these decisions do conflict with maintenance education. But I

think a proper definition of maintenance education would not conflict with these notions.

One of the issues that now seem to be haunting people with respect to this matter is that the Supreme Court in the *Bakke* decision raised the issue of whether the regulations on which HEW based its May 25 memorandum and on which in turn the Supreme Court decided the *Lau* case are in fact an improper interpretation of Title VI. Because the regulation said that any action with a discriminatory effect is prohibited irrespective of the intent of the school district, many school districts are saying it appears that the *Lau* decision is in trouble. I would like to differ. The Supreme Court subsequent to the *Bakke* decision appeared to pull back from that position and, as far as I am concerned, the *Lau* decision is still good and strong law.

So, in some sense, the first federal court to order bilingual education did so because it saw it as a necessary element of successfully achieving desegregation.

Even if the issue of intent were to be undercut, I still think that the principle that identical education is not equal education will remain. I think there is a more important idea to be learned from the *Bakke* decision. In *Bakke* the University of California attempted to justify a racial quota system on the grounds that diversity in education, which is what was achieved through this quota system, was a compelling state interest that could justify a form of intentional discrimination against white persons. The court did not quite go that far because the court did not permit a quota system to stand, but the court did say that the University of California could take race into account in reviewing the admissions applications of students.

To permit a public institution even to take race into account, the state has to have a strong justification, and the Supreme Court in *Bakke* found that justification. The justification is that diversity in education—to have black and white children, to have brown and white children, to have brown and black children encountering one another—is such an important educational objective that some form of discrimination against white persons can take place. What the courts have faced, with the question of how to harmonize bilingual education and desegregation, is that bilingual education, as the courts in the Tenth Circuit stated in *Keyes* v. *Denver*, may not serve as an excuse for failure to integrate children. There are probably a number of good reasons: (1) Because historically many districts in Texas and California did not want brown and white children together, so they set up separate language schools. (2) If you start accepting that rationale, you may be saying something very dangerous about keeping black and white children apart as well. (3) The first definition of equality—that is, separate but equal—cannot exist as a constitutional principle, whereas the principle of bilingual education may be only a statutory principle. I say "may" because that issue is still a matter of legal controversy.

In other words, bilingual education may not serve as an excuse not to desegregate. At the same time, because the court wants diversity and wants integration to succeed, I think that any program that brings children together in large enough clusters so that they will have a real bilingual program will be acceptable. In fact, in a number of cases, this is exactly what the federal courts have permitted.

Time and time again a court has ordered black and white children to integrate, and Hispanic groups have intervened at the last minute to ask, "How are we going to be treated under this plan?" It becomes clear that Hispanic children are going to be moved as well, and the courts will order that the children be moved in such a way as to preserve their bilingual programs. So here we have groups, which perhaps have different definitions of equality, needing a little bit different kind of treatment to achieve equality. The two concepts can be harmonized and can work together.

In other words, bilingual education may not serve as an excuse not to desegregate.

Second Speaker

Thomas M. Griffin, Chief Counsel, Legal Office, California State Department of Education

It is my pleasure to share with you a few thoughts on the progress or lack of progress of integration and the legal requirements that face us in California today.

I am reminded of the story about the doctor, the engineer, and the lawyer who were arguing about whose occupation was the oldest. The doctor said, "Well, in the beginning God created woman from the rib of the man, and that was a medical feat." And the engineer said, "Well, there were engineers before that because the Book says that the Father created order out of chaos, and that was an engineering feat." And the laywer said, "Well, there were lawyers before that; who do you think created the chaos?"

I think much of the chaos during integration has been created by lawyers. The creation of order in the months and years ahead will not be an engineering feat, but an educational one. I think our story, in terms of the requirements that face us now in California, has to start with *Keyes* v. *Denver*—although the background for the integration and the requirements for determining that a district was under an obligation to desegregate schools developed, of course, out of dual southern school systems. The court for the first time applied those principles to northern school districts, requiring, quite logically, that any official action that contributed to the segregation of the races was unconstitutional and had to be corrected.

A distinction was made between deliberate segregation, official segregation if you will, and segregation that just happens by accident, or de facto segregation. The court was faced in every instance with finding that the school system, the government, and the school board in some way had contributed to the segregation that existed. The remedy, then, once that finding was in place, was the elimination of that segregation.

The converse was also true. When there was no finding of intentional segregation of one ethnic group from another, then there was no obligation under the Fourteenth Amendment to integrate the schools. So we had the dichotomy that existed in California. One can argue that that distinction existed in California until 1976, when the California Supreme Court interpreted the desegregation requirements under state law and under the state constitution.

In that decision the court did four very interesting things. First of all, the court eliminated the distinction between de jure segregation and de facto. It said that school districts have an obligation to eliminate the segregation that exists, regardless of how it was formed. The court did that for two basic reasons. One is that the child whose educational opportunities are being denied does not know whether the segregation is deliberate or not, but the impact on the child and the deprivation of educational opportunity are just as real. Secondly, the court perceived, and I think correctly, the distinction between de facto and de jure segregation as "angels dancing on the head of a pin." In every case in California in which the distinction was an issue, the courts have found that the school district was guilty of intentional segregation.

Sometimes the burden is difficult for the plaintiffs. The law is clear that they must trace the history of the governing board actions from the 1920s through the 1970s. You look to the pattern established by a governing board when it was faced with choices such as where to build schools and how to draw the attendance areas. And when the board did that in *Keyes*, it found that as the black neighborhood expanded, the school district would keep building smaller schools that would serve the black area only, rather than larger schools that would draw from both black and white areas. That was intentional segregation.

The court was faced in every instance with finding that the school system, the government, and the school board in some way had contributed to the segregation that existed.

In Oxnard, California, the federal court remanded a case for a trial on whether the segregation was legal or illegal, deliberate or unintentional. When the plaintiffs reread the governing board minutes, they found some interesting things. One was that the secretary of the board of education in those days was very meticulous and took very careful notes about what was said in meetings. They found a statement in the minutes of the governing board in which a trustee said in effect, that it was the policy of the board to keep the Mexican kids where they belong. Do you have any doubt that that was intentional segregation?

There have been a very few cases in which a governing board has won on that issue. The second thing that the court did in the Oxnard case (*Crawford*) is that it modified the references to segregation. The term that the court used was *isolation*; the court focused on not just racial balance in terms of percentages and numbers but the effect of isolation in the

educational program that deprives those children of an equal educational opportunity. The court made it clear that absolute balance was not the constitutional requirement. The question was what happens to the educational opportunity of the minority students.

The court said the districts are under an obligation to take reasonable and feasible steps to alleviate the isolation. It did not make school boards the guarantors of absolute racial balance. Then the court did another interesting thing, considering the passage of time. It said that the primary responsibility for alleviating this isolation was that of the governing boards of school districts and that the courts should stay out of the process where the educators showed some reasonable promise of making some progress. If the school districts are making progress or showing promise of making progress, said the Supreme Court, then courts ought to stay out of it. Well, that was good advice.

The State Board of Education decided to get into the act at that point and continue what had been for some years a leadership role in the area. The regulations had been written in 1969, without the benefit of any underlying statute, and those regulations had been set aside by Proposition 21 in 1972.

The Board decided at this point that what was needed was not another mandate, because it is hard to beat the Supreme Court for mandates. What was needed was a process for districts to go through to examine the schools to determine whether they had an obligation under *Crawford,* because school districts were on the spot. In many areas, of course, it took a court order, and even then sometimes that was not entirely sufficient. There had been only a few districts that adopted desegregation plans without any kind of intervention by a court or anybody else. So what the State Board realized is that districts, in a sense,

The court said the districts are under an obligation to take reasonable and feasible steps to alleviate the isolation.

needed a crutch or needed a stick. The districts needed to know that, when they started in on the desegregation process to implement the requirement of *Crawford,* they were not alone in doing it. Every school district was going through the same thing; and, if the district wanted to blame the state for the need to have to go through it, that was fine.

So what the Board did was adopt regulations that required a specific process for districts to go through, and it involved community participation and educational components. Now, I am not going to go through all of the requirements of the regulations and the guidelines; that is a different workshop altogether. It is enough, I think, to point out that the process is primarily an educational one, and we drew on the experience of districts that had gone through the process and gone through it successfully. There are all kinds of techniques for moving from desegregation to integration and all of those educational components that make the transportation worthwhile and contribute not just to black children and white children and Asians and Hispanics sitting next to each other but to an integrated educational setting in which each child draws on the background of the other.

It is enough, I think, to point out that the process is primarily an educational one, and we drew on the experience of districts that had gone through the process and gone through it successfully.

Some 70 school districts went through this process and certified to us that they found, indeed, that they had one or more schools that were segregated or were in danger of becoming segregated and that they had adopted plans to eliminate or reduce that segregation. Now maybe 70 districts are not all that many out of 1,043 in the state, but this is 70 more than we had to start with and ten times as many as we ever got by having court orders.

To the best of my knowledge, there was not a single board of education recalled in the process or a single superintendent fired for his or her leadership in the area, and there was only one court case that came out of it.

The Oxnard Union High School District adopted a plan, and, I have to be honest with you, it was not the greatest plan in the world. I think those of us from Sacramento who have all kinds of wisdom in this area would say it did not go far enough. Probably a superior court judge would say it did not go far enough, and maybe some members of the minority community would think it did not go far enough. But it went further than anything had gone before, and the district was sued by some white people who did not care to have even that degree of integration.

When it got to trial, the court said the district had complied with the State Board regulations and guidelines and the trial court was not going to intervene.

The court of appeals, however, was not so charitable. The court of appeals set that decision aside and remanded it back to the board for more community input. Surprisingly, two things happened in a very short period of time. One was the latest court of appeals decision in *Crawford*. The court of appeals decided a couple of things. It decided that Proposition 1, the Robbins initiative, was constitutional. What the Robbins initiative did is not very clear. On the one hand it seemed to say that the original *Crawford* decision was set aside and the distinction between de jure segregation and de facto segregation was reinstated so that nobody in California had a duty to integrate unless required to do so under the federal Constitution. That is what it seemed to say. The court of appeals said no, that is not correct. What the Robbins initiative said is that courts cannot order busing unless it would be an appropriate remedy under the federal rule.

The court of appeals said, however, that under *Crawford* school districts still have an obligation to alleviate the segregation of minority students, however it is brought about, and that the Robbins initiative, Proposition 1, did not affect the duty of school districts at all but only affected the power of courts in ordering a remedy. Well, that is kind of a puzzle, because what you have then is a duty that is unenforceable. At least it is unenforceable by a court. Maybe that is not such a bad thing.

When the plaintiffs in *Crawford* tried to get a hearing before the Supreme Court to get that straightened out, the Supreme Court refused to grant the hearing and let that decision stand.

The second thing the court of appeals did, which I thought was rather strange, was that it found as a matter of law that the Los Angeles Unified School District did not deliberately segregate. Now in 1969 the trial court found, indeed, that Los Angeles Unified did intentionally segregate and was guilty of de jure segregation, and that finding was affirmed by the Supreme Court. But the court of appeals said that is not right because the later federal decisions that have come out, including *Dayton* and *Columbus* last year, gave enough of an insight into what the federal rule is that they could say that there was no longer any obligation under federal law to integrate the schools in Los Angeles.

About the time that the Supreme Court refused to grant a hearing in *Crawford,* it granted a hearing in the case of *McKinney* v. *Oxnard Union High School District,* and that case has now been briefed. There will probably be an oral argument on that case, maybe within a month, and maybe a decision, another decision for the State Supreme Court by summer on the status of the requirement under *Crawford* that school districts eliminate all forms of discrimination and segregation.

You have to have a community that realizes that the goal of integration and integrated education is not going to be obtained at the price of academic success.

The other case that is still pending in the area of integration is *Tinsely* v. *Ravenswood.* Ravenswood is a small district on the San Francisco Peninsula that is almost entirely black. It is surrounded by districts that are almost entirely white. The plaintiffs seek to have those districts integrated. Or, put another way, they want those districts to take reasonably feasible steps to eliminate the isolation of the minority pupils in Ravenswood. Well, I do not think that a court is going to have too much trouble with that case because the federal cases make clear that an interdistrict remedy is appropriate only where the plaintiffs are able to show deliberate design to segregate the children in the different districts. They really cannot do that in Ravenswood because the boundaries were there long before any black children were around.

Now if courts cannot order it, how does it come about? Well, I think that is up to you and me. If the adoption of Proposition 1 and the decision in *Crawford* are to have any beneficial effect at all, it is that integration is no longer going to be considered a judicial problem. It is going to be considered an educational problem, and school districts still have an obligation under *Crawford* and under the State Board regulations to examine their schools and take reasonably feasible steps to eliminate the isolation of minority children. Those plans have to have some educational components to them, community participation and support. You have to have support and leadership from your local board of education, which they never had in Los Angeles. You have to have parents who are willing to give it a try. You have to have a community that realizes that the goal of integration and integrated education is not going to be obtained at the price of academic success. In short, the parents have to know that the education at the end of the bus ride is

at least as good as the education they get closer to home.

Courts cannot mandate that. Sacramento cannot mandate that, either. The State Board of Education cannot mandate that commitment. But you in the districts can develop that commitment. We have to focus on integration, not as the problem, but as the solution. Desegregation in Los Angeles was the problem because nobody focused on educational opportunity or lack of educational opportunity as the problem for which integration was the solution. We have to keep our eye on the problem. All those are educational challenges, not legal ones, and if there is a message to

You have to have support and leadership from your local board of education . . . .

be learned in Los Angeles, it is that courts ought to stay out of it and that the development of integration programs has to be done at the local level by people of goodwill, with some education and some background and some comon sense.

■■■■■

Third Speaker

John Graham, Professor of Education, California State University, Long Beach

We are talking today about legal requirements related to desegregation and bilingual education, a topic that is very close to my heart and interests, because I think it is basic to the whole concept of equality in public education. I have been a desegregation specialist and consultant to 20 school districts across this country embroiled in the delicate task of developing school desegregation plans. I helped develop a desegregation plan for Philadelphia in 1977. I became a very well-known passenger on American Airlines, flying back there almost every week, working with my colleague Neil Sullivan in developing the master plan for Philadelphia. The initiation had been prompted by the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission.

I have found in working with this problem that people have been able to polarize and divide various forces that were plaintiffs. We have found a very unpleasant schism among minorities in their quests for equality of educational opportunity. I found even a somewhat disheartening spirit among blacks in their less than wholehearted support for Hispanics and other language groups in their quest for equality relative to bilingual education. This spirit, I think, has to change. We must have a united effort, a wholesome concept, and a thrust for equality of educational opportunity.

I am not one who advocates state-level litigation for bilingual education, multilingual education, or equal educational opportunities. I have seen by way of state courts the abdication of this responsibility, and I think success will only come in terms of ultimate meeting of requirements through federal litigation. There are many loopholes and gaps, but when we give it serious thought very few victories have been won via state courts in terms of significant litigation and even less in state-level legislation or administrative edicts.

Massachusetts and Wisconsin are the only states that have tried to encourage school integration and educational opportunities for minorities. Massachusetts has Chapter 636, which funds some seed money for an exploration across school district boundary lines. Wisconsin has used busing to implement its plans. If we turn anywhere else in the country, we have to look at some things that may be occurring in federal courts.

Courts have established principles of law that they take a position on when controversy arises. Congress enacts certain statutes. The U.S. Department of Education then comes up with an interpretation in rules and regulations or policy guidelines. This filters down to state governments and local school boards, where they get into the act of interpretation. From that the argument starts all over again, and it ends up back in court.

It is true that we have looked at the needs of minorities in our thrust for equality of educational opportunity. We have looked too long. We took the melting pot too literally when we thought we could solve the problem by busing children across town. Some had not only desegregation needs, but also language and educational skill needs. We have never placed them all on the drawing board at the same time. I have yet to see a respectable bilingual master plan in any original court desegregation plan in this country. It has not existed. Bilingual advocates have come along as intervenors, subsequently, sometimes at a very painful cost and sometimes to the extent of causing polarization

and schisms and divisions among the very groups who were fighting to bring about desegregation in the first place. We might give sober reflection to this as we think about where we go now in an uncertain future in terms of the legal requirements for all phases of equality of educational opportunity.

■■■■■

Fourth Speaker

John McLevie, Integration Analyst, San Diego City Unified School District

My title of Integration Analyst may puzzle you. I want to absolve the San Diego City Unified School District of responsibility for what I might say. I am working for them for one year, not as an administrator but as an analyst for the school governing board, which is under a court order. I was chairman of secondary education at San Diego State and hope to go back.

Let me help to provide a sort of a bridge as you think about the educational implications of what we have heard this morning. Were I competent as a lawyer I would not wish to argue with any of the points made by the other speakers. This is a time of economic fear, I believe, in many parts of this country. Those who feel insecure tend to look for scapegoats, and I think schools in general have been scapegoats for a number of years. They are victims of unreal and unfair expectations.

Bilingual education is another area which rapidly is being picked out as a scapegoat. On the one hand, there are those in our population who are fearful of investing in the future of a language group which at least in southern California may well be the majority of our youth population. These people would prefer to secure their future by suppressing the opportunities of the group they fear. This has happened before in the history of humankind, but it never works for long.

On the other hand there are more sophisticated debaters who claim that bilingual education is not proven and does not produce educationally. Majority-dominated systems have not produced good results for majority-race students in our inner cities in the last 50 years, either, I would remind them. Yet, bilingual education is asked to prove itself in one-tenth of that time.

The legal imperative is established—it is equality. The social imperative is obvious—to make an equal and a just society. Integration programs and bilingual education are partners in this social enterprise. The educational imperative, I believe, rests upon many of us in this room today. This educational imperative is part of equality. If you take off the "e," you have quality. For me it is the quality of bilingual education that will help to secure its credibility.

In San Diego bilingual education includes Spanish-speaking, Vietnamese-speaking, Laotian-speaking, and Cambodian-speaking young people, to mention only the largest of our bilingual groups. We now have 5,000 Indo-Chinese children in our LEP-NEP program, equivalent to the number of Spanish-bilingual children in the LEP-NEP program. We have many more Hispanic children, but of course they are not in those programs at this point. One-third of the children in one of the elementary schools which I visited yesterday are Laotian-speaking, lest you feel that we mostly are dealing with Vietnamese-speaking children. The rumor is that the majority of refugees waiting in Asian camps are Cambodian, and that will bring us another group that will be large enough to need special attention.

Integration programs and bilingual education are partners in the social enterprise.

The attitude of many educators about our Indo-Chinese students worries me greatly. I keep hearing that the parents and the Indo-Chinese community, whatever that is, do not want bilingual programs. They want crash courses in English. Let me remind you that that is exactly where crash courses lead—to crashes. We have to aim at the future retention, in junior and senior high schools, for both Indo-Chinese and Hispanic. I think that something like 70 percent of the children who drop out of our system are Hispanics. So the solution is not to crash people into English in a hurry. Our problem is to ensure the success of our children through the junior and senior high schools. I think it is imperative for educators to seek

ways to inform Indo-Chinese parents and community leaders about the quality of bilingual programs and how they can help develop that quality for retention of their children in the school system.

Materials are short in some of the language areas I mentioned, particularly short in the Laotian and the Cambodian areas. Even educators make the case to me that the children seem to be making out well without this material. School principals tell me this, and sometimes I feel we have our worst educational enemies in the midst of our own community. There is a backlash here that could also hit at the commitment to continue developing our Spanish bilingual program.

I spoke of quality, and that is where we must make our drive as educators at this time. School district and university personnel have to get together on this, I believe. Perhaps that is a personal view, because I regard myself as moving between the two.

We need quality results from our bilingual programs. That means we need fairer tests, not just a Spanish translation of the English-language instruments. Programs need to be skillfully designed; they need to utilize our latest knowledge about how children learn. Our bilingual teachers and ESL teachers need special skills. I do not believe that primary-language and ESL skills are identical; each requires some special attention.

It is through the quality of our bilingual program that bilingual education will answer its doubters and detractors. The laws have been given to us. We have started our work on program development to implement the laws. It is to the quality of those programs that I believe we must now turn our attention, not only to prove to our young people that they can achieve and that bilingualism aids that achievement, but also to attract monolingual children to second-language courses of quality. Quality education is the basis of true integration programs.

Quality education is the basis of true integration programs.

GENERAL SESSION THREE

ROLE OF STATE LEADERSHIP IN ACHIEVING PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN DESEGREGATION AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Keynote Speaker:

Benjamin Williams, Director, Education Improvement Center, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado

I wish to reassert what has been stated many times from this podium: a productive, enriching, and legally feasible interface between bilingual education and desegregation can be achieved. The National Task Force on Desegregation Strategies over a three-year period went through some of the hard, cold facts and concerns on this issue. They asserted that it could be achieved. In 1977 the Hispanics conducted a national conference on desegregation in Washington, D.C., and nothing came out of that conference which indicated that this productive experience could not be achieved. A few regional conferences have been held around the country. The Illinois State Department of Education convened a consultation on the topic. Today I want to share with California some of the things that came out of the Illinois consultation. It will be beneficial to report those conclusions.

The group said most articulately that the conflict between bilingual education and desegregation is more fabricated than real. They went on to argue that perhaps the fabrication was derived from those forces that for their own reasons, good or bad, would like to see both bilingual education and desegregation just go away.

Like most of the things worth doing in our society, the interface may be more difficult in some situations than in other situations. Regarding the real question, which I interpret to be how can black and Hispanic interests be served through interfacing bilingual education and desegregation, some would argue that most of the difficulty is fabricated and/or imagined.

Let me discuss briefly the information cited by those who argue this way. First, there are several commonalities from which the educational needs of blacks and Hispanics are derived. One commonality is that our educational needs result from poverty. Three different kinds of solutions have been proposed. On the one hand, compensatory education has evolved as a programmatic method of meeting the needs of poor children. Second, the recognition that poor children tend to go to schools where education resources are limited has resulted in extensive efforts to reform state school finance systems. As a result, greater equity has been achieved in recent years in the financing of education, which in turn has helped provide equal educational opportunities for disadvantaged students. In the case of black students, the third strategy has been that of school desegregation, and now that strategy involves Hispanics.

Another commonality for us all is that our educational needs result from cultural differences. I need only to mention the vast, rich culture of the Mexican Hispanics; I need not talk in detail about the cultural differences and cultural riches of black people. But these are often seen as having negative value in this society, and so our educational needs result from cultural differences.

A third factor is that our educational needs result from linguistic differences. This factor involves most directly the Hispanic population. But in the case of Ann Arbor, Michigan, we see that it also involves the black population, not so much because the language they speak is different but because the language they speak is disliked and rejected.

There is a fourth commonality. Educational needs result from high mobility in urban areas, from children being transient and our not being able to efficiently follow them and their records. Thus, educators do not know many of the students they teach. Although this is primarily a migrant or Hispanic issue, one should realize that there are other migrant minority groups. The problem of mobility in urban areas raises some of the same problems.

Let me touch upon some of the problems. The first is the anxiety I perceive among Hispanics when one talks about desegregation. My colleagues have indicated that Hispanics believe that the burden falling on Hispanic families as a result of busing is vastly greater than that experienced by black families. My colleagues argue that in some instances the school facilities for Hispanics are generally pretty good. They

argue also that the segregated schools are controlled by Hispanics and that is precisely the way they want it. An example that is cited is the Pueblo School in Denver, which is community-controlled. Then they argue that in cases where desegregation has occurred, Hispanics have lost access to minority staff. They say that the lack of minority advocacy in desegregated schools is particularly devastating to their interests.

> ***. . . Greater equity has been achieved in recent years in the financing of education, which in turn has helped provide equal educational opportunities for disadvantaged students.***

For example, when a school is desegregated, Hispanic children lose some of the benefits of the leadership they had before, and especially the benefits of advocacy for bilingual education. Parents argue that sometimes there is a loss of Title I funds when desegregation occurs; that there is a loss of political and social power and support systems; and that failure to provide special transportation lays a special burden on this group, for instance, when parents are not provided with buses so they can participate in the affairs of the new school.

Some people claim that the school district's tactics of playing both ends against the middle, on the question of a choice between bilingual education and desegregation, without letting them know they can have both, make it very difficult for both groups. They challenge the practice of the courts in creating remedies which involve the integration of blacks and Hispanics; that is, they say what good is it when the poor are desegregated with the poor, and when blacks and Hispanics are desegregated only with each other. This is a significant issue when one looks at the demographic trends of some 126 major cities in this country, where blacks and Hispanics in at least half of the cases make up 75 percent or more of the population.

Lastly, some of my colleagues say that exclusion of Hispanics in black and white decision making is particularly detrimental; that is, when we talk about desegregation, we usually talk in black or white terms. Thus, the decision makers become blacks and whites, and Hispanics are left out. Some Hispanics, I suppose, would argue that desegregation is more devastating in its net effect than segregated education.

As I have gone through this, you who are familiar with the arguments from the side of blacks with regard to desegregation can see that these are the same complaints that blacks have expressed about desegregation. They too say that the burden they have to bear with regard to busing is more substantial than it is in the case of the Anglos; that desegregated schools in many instances are worse than segregated schools. They point to the growing statistics on expulsions and suspensions, the double discipline standards, and the pervasive social system of the schools which promotes the values of the dominant group. So while our problems are massive, they are also similar.

I assume there are some other concerns that might tend to make people angry. Blacks make the charge, which Shirley McCune talked about in another context, that Hispanics come in late in the desegregation complaint process, that they only enter in the remedy phase, and that this is significant as perceived by blacks because Hispanics in the final analysis will claim or will want to be counted as white rather than as members of a Third World group.

This concern was voiced over and over again in the studies that our task force made over a three-year period. One of the task force members from Detroit, Mildred Kyles, said that in Detroit Hispanic children are listed as white on their birth certificates. I recall that Lorenza Schmidt would look at her and say, "But we have to work this out together." What Ms. Kyles was saying was that Hispanics and blacks can never form a coalition on the issues that affect them, because in the final analysis Hispanics want to be white.

Now keep in mind, I am not saying that is true. I am simply indicating the serious issues that divide us.

In the case of Hispanics, they argue that blacks are out front; that blacks talk about slavery; that blacks have received all the dollars; that blacks are particularly adroit at posing the black/white issue, the racism issue; that they imply it only involves black people and never talk about the discrimination and the disadvantages of the Hispanic group; and that, therefore, blacks are out for themselves and there cannot be a coalition and we cannot work together.

These are the hard issues. I guess each group may be right in a certain sense. The perceptions are there nonetheless, and so we are in a period in which we need some type of leadership to bring these groups together and to affirm the truth of the statement I made initially: that Hispanics and bilingual education and desegregation can interface.

There are many examples across the country that deal with the technical problems of how the interface can be achieved. There also is disagreement about some of the solutions, how you achieve a comfortable interface. For example, Peter Roos has said that the

Boston model is a good one—that is, where you have clusters of 20 or more bilingual students and you place them in schools, and then you place in those schools the blacks and the Anglos that would bring about an integrated situation. But leave the cluster there, so that services can be provided for the bilingual children and they will have access to the resources and the services. Jose Cardenas argues that the cluster is a myth, that we really need individualized instruction, and that schools need to begin programming around individualized instruction.

There are other ways of achieving good results from the techniques involved. We have seen, in desegregated situations, magnet schools placed on the rim of the black/white community, or within the black community, and Hispanics argue that it is they who ought to receive "good schools"—the magnet schools. And then there is disagreement about that, because it is a travesty to place a magnet school within a Hispanic/black community and then not allow black or Hispanic children to attend that school.

The technical problems are difficult, but they can be worked out. The problem is one of philosophy, of ideology, or of politics.

We now have a shift of civil rights machinery from the federal government back to the states. That is the single most important development in the realm of education. Some 33 states have equal educational opportunity clauses in their constitutions. Another 36 or so have regulations and/or legislation dealing with the problem of desegregation. Some 22 states support minimal programs in bilingual education. As Shirley McCune pointed out, this may be a trap because the support might help to continue to segregate language-minority children.

We also have the problem of some Hispanic children and black children who will never have an integrated experience, except perhaps when they get out of school and into the world of work.

And so we have to have a two-pronged goal as to the state's role. One is to improve those desegregated bilingual situations already in existence, and the other is to begin to formulate new and expanded definitions of equal educational opportunities so that there can be some recognition that those black and Hispanic schools that will never be desegregated at least offer a good academic experience, so we do not lose another generation.

As the federal government talks about shifting control and resources back to the states, and as the states look at the problems of achieving equal educational opportunity and protecting the civil rights of minorities, I have a suspicion that the states are going to say, "We do not want that problem."

That is something they cannot be allowed to say. They have a role. Let me briefly mention the specific components of such a role:

1. Clear policy directives
2. A commitment to policy
3. Understanding the use of existing state authority
4. Incentives to increase residential opportunity for minorities
5. Good technical assistance
6. Monitoring and sanctioning

In the final analysis, if minorities do not receive their civil rights, then it is the state that has the responsibility of providing sanctions against that travesty of justice.

The state has another role—to offer mechanisms for public understanding and support. I have talked about some of the problems and concerns that blacks have with Hispanics and Hispanics have with blacks over these issues. Many of these things require the education of the black and Hispanic communities about the importance of a desegregated learning setting in the broader world perspective.

We now have a shift of civil rights machinery from the federal government back to the states.

I commend the Office of Intergroup Relations for having started to carry out the state role. It may be difficult, but all of us here believe strongly that it is education that is the hope for our children, and we should not let anyone take that hope away from us. I charge this group to go forth and let the state of California know that there is no conflict between bilingual education and desegregation, that indeed they can together create enriching experiences and make the world richer as a result of California's children having gone to school together.

GENERAL SESSION FOUR

ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

First Speaker:

Mary McDonald, Lau Center, Northern California

We are not too sure about the future of civil rights technical assistance throughout the country, but at present Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides assistance in several ways to local educational agencies (LEAs) that are trying to develop equal educational opportunities.

First, the Act funds state departments of education so that they can provide technical assistance in school desegregation. This is what the Office of Intergroup Relations does and how it receives part of its funding. The Act also provides the state with some funding for national origin desegregation assistance. Some funding also is provided through Title IV for assistance in sex equity.

The Civil Rights Act, through Title IV, provides desegregation assistance centers throughout the country. I am in charge of one of the desegregation assistance centers—one of the Lau centers. There are nine such centers around the country, two of which are here in California, one serving northern California and one serving southern California. The state also has race desegregation assistance centers and sex desegregation assistance centers. I do hope that all of you here are availing yourselves of that variety of assistance for achieving equity.

The Lau Center in northern California serves all the counties from the Oregon border down to Tulare County and Kings County. In the north, we help districts plan comprehensively to address the equity needs of the national-origin-minority students (Hispanics, Asians, American Indians, Pacific Islanders, Portuguese, Armenians, and so forth). The concentration of national-origin-minority students is greater in northern California than it is in southern California.

We often are following along on the heels of the Office for Civil Rights, which is the enforcement agency located in San Francisco for this region, and we are providing the assistance to develop the plans and assurances that the Office for Civil Rights is looking for among your districts. Maybe some of you know that experience well. At other times we are just called on by districts voluntarily seeking to plan and provide more equitable services, and sometimes we are on the road just trying to convince people to plan and provide more equitable services.

I remember a little cartoon from years ago of a princess addressing a frog, and it is how we feel often in this business. And I know it is how you feel as advocates in your own district sometimes. The princess is looking at this frog with a sort of glowing promise in her eyes, and the frog is simply saying, "But I do not want to be turned into a handsome prince. I just want you to love me for what I am."

We are working on both the will to change and the way to change. We need both the commitment and the skills to carry out that commitment for the children.

I would just ask you to consider one question that is on our mind this year: How can equity efforts work together better in each school district? Previously, we have seen a rather isolated effort toward equity in Title IX, for example. Title IX makes its own individual demands on the personnel office, on principals, on curriculum, and so forth. Then we see another, rather isolated effort toward equity in race desegregation. And we see those particular demands in affirmative action, sensitivity for principals and staff, redistribution of children, and so forth—all those things going on in another area of the district.

And then in a third area of the district, sometimes in a third office, we find the responsibility for bilingual education and national-origin-minority desegregation. We see another set of demands on the personnel office, on principals, on curriculum, and so forth. All those equity issues are going on rather independently. Now I am ready and eager to think about the ways that these equity efforts may work in a more closely interwoven fashion in each school district.

Second Speaker

Juan Hurtado, Lau Center, Southern California

The Lau Center for southern California is located on the campus of San Diego State University. It serves ten counties that extend from San Luis Obispo, Kern, and San Bernardino to the Mexican border. Southern California has 25 percent of the national-origin-minority population in the country.

In providing technical assistance to the districts, the Lau Center abides by the task force remedies. It has been indicated that the proposed guidelines are dead, but the *Lau* remedies still are alive. We do not know what is going to happen, but I think what we must do right now is try to move as quickly as possible to get districts to act on the task force remedies. Each district receives different kinds of assistance because of the changes of leadership in the districts. In developing plans that are in compliance with the task force remedies, a district moves very quickly to comply with the OCR, and then there is a change of leadership. We have to repeat the education process. California has statutes that were a response to *Lau;* so while we are giving technical assistance concerning the federal regulations, we are also called upon to integrate those federal regulations with the state mandates. That calls for a special type of technical assistance in areas such as reclassification and exit criteria. One need that is critical is a positive attitude concerning the implementation of *Lau.* Before we can talk about implementing a plan, if there is a negative attitude on the part of people who do not understand bilingual education or the desegregation process, we have to try to get across to the district leadership that the bilingual education process is part of quality education. That is a type of technical assistance that we give. We also conduct conferences. Before they graduate, students must demonstrate standards of proficiency in the basic skills of reading, writing, and computation. In the conferences we are trying to get educators to integrate those minimum standards with the bilingual education programs.

Before they graduate, students must demonstrate standards of proficiency in the basic skills of reading, writing, and computation.

The Lau Center also tries to integrate the desegregation process with bilingual education. The center works with the community on educational issues and with the public at large to inform them of the desegregation process.

The notion that the *Lau* remedies will go away and that national-origin-minority students will somehow be lost in the huge mass of people has been growing. However, the needs assessment of California indicates that technical assistance will have to increase. Even if Lau centers are not available, even if the state law is not going to be there, even if mandates are not going to be in effect, the number of national-origin-minority students will be on the increase. So this type of technical assistance, trying to integrate these programs, will be necessary.

■■■■■

Third Speaker

Daniel Holt, Consultant, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education

The Lau Center in Sacramento is located in the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education. It has three staff members—Mario Muniz, Maria Vasquez, and I. The three of us focus our energies primarily on working in a supportive way with Lau centers in Oakland and San Diego. We have established a network with them and attempt to coordinate activities as we deliver assistance to the large number of school districts that request it.

Also, working within the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, we have an excellent opportunity to work with many projects in which the office is involved. One of our strengths is to bring to bear other expertise that is available within the office to better serve school districts in implementing national origin desegregation through coordination with San Diego and Oakland.

We really attempt to establish linkages and to enhance the network because we realize that, given the complexity of the issues and the enormity of the task, it is impossible to do this work alone. We have tried to draw clearer and more solid lines of cooperation

among the units in the Department of Education and also in the field. Because we do work intimately with the projects in the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, I'd like to enumerate them, and also indicate that services are available from the other 13 consultants in the office.

One project is called Data Bical. Data provided by districts in the Language Census are consolidated in this data base. On the basis of the enrollment figures for limited-English-proficient students, we do different kinds of things with those data. We have completed about 20 reports that show patterns of enrollment of limited-English-proficient students. The reports illustrate the way the data break out within districts, within counties, and throughout the state. We make the data available to users, such as the Lau centers, bilingual education service centers, school districts, and offices of county superintendents.

The main job of the Office of Bilingual Education is to administer bilingual education programs as required by state law. We develop regulations submitted by the Department to the State Board. Once the regulations are established, we provide assistance in interpreting them. In addition, we are developing quality indicators for bilingual program implementation at the elementary and secondary levels. We provide workshops on developing programs based on legal requirements but with an emphasis on improving educational outcomes for language-minority students.

In cooperation with the other Lau centers, we are developing handbooks for Asian and minority-language groups in the state. These groups include Vietnamese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Filipino, Japanese, Ilocano, Cambodian, Laotian, Armenian, Punjabi, and Samoan. Each handbook follows the same pattern, giving detailed information on immigration history, education in the native country, and community patterns in California. Another section deals with the language of the group from a linguistic point of view. The final part deals with how to develop reading and writing skills in those languages through a bilingual program. Each handbook will be about 80 pages in length and will provide a thorough overview of each language group. We have established teams to write, review, and critique the handbooks.

The main job of the Office of Bilingual Education is to administer bilingual education programs as required by state law.

We have been involved in looking at proficiency standards for graduation and integrating those requirements within bilingual programs. To do that, we have been working closely with the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research, which is responsible for proficiency standards.

We provide workshops on how to perform native-language assessments for language-minority students pursuant to the proficiency requirements and to obtain a more accurate picture of the students' language development and development of basic skills.

We also work with the Office of Special Education on addressing the needs of limited-English-proficient students who are eligible for special education programs. To do that, we have focused primarily on teacher training. With the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, we have developed training opportunities for people who are now working as speech and language therapists, nurses, and speech pathologists. They are receiving high-intensity language training in Spanish, Cantonese, and Vietnamese so that they can develop second-language skills to do assessment of language-minority students. We provide workshops at the county level, at a multidistrict level, and sometimes at the district level. We are particularly interested in developing trainers who then become available to work with neighboring districts.

■■■■■

Fourth Speaker

Ples Griffin, Chief, Office of Intergroup Relations, State Department of Education

The Office of Intergroup Relations is a unit in the State Department of Education that provides assistance to school districts and offices of county superintendents of schools and helps coordinate the efforts of state and federal agencies. Specifically, we provide technical assistance in the areas of school desegregation and integration. A second area is equal employment opportunities in education, including affirmative action employment programs. A third, multicultural education, includes preservice and in-service staff

development for teachers and other school staff and the development of curricular materials and teaching skills that use the cultural strengths of our diverse student populations. A fourth area is what we like to call conflict management, in which we help districts to deal with problems of disruptive conduct and, hopefully, the prevention or the minimizing of school violence and vandalism.

Many interrelationships exist among the areas of responsibility assigned to this unit. Essentially, school desegregation and integration encompass the other considerations and responsibilities that I have identified. We are not interested merely in the reassignment of students on a racial and ethnic basis. If all we are going to do is shift bodies around and do nothing else in terms of the educational development of that experience, then it is a wasted effort. We are much more concerned with the integration that will occur. An essential part of that, of course, is desegregation.

We are concerned about the quality of relationships that will flow from young people being together and sharing experiences in a school setting. In order to do that, we have to deal with some of the issues that

If all we are going to do is shift bodies around and do nothing else in terms of the educational development of that experience, then it is a wasted effort.

Shirley McCune identified in her presentation. She referred to them as the levels of desegregation, but she included the same things we mean by integration.

She talked about physical desegregation, to provide the opportunity for interaction and educational contact in a school setting. The second area she identified was access, particularly in the matter of dealing with language needs, to all the opportunities and offerings of the school experience. The third area was that of interaction with significant adults or role models who can provide cross-cultural experiences. In order for these to be meaningful, there has to be some retraining and extension of training of adults who work in school settings.

We in the Office of Intergroup Relations are very much concerned that each school should have a diversity of staff to whom minority students as well as majority students can relate. Minority young people must have role models with whom they can identify. At the same time, it is important for majority-group young people to find that there are persons from other backgrounds who are skillful, who are talented, and who make major contributions to the development of our country. There is no better place in which this can be provided than in a school setting.

I would like to spend a little time talking about conflict management. Occasionally, I make statements that are upsetting to people in the Department of Education. These statements essentially deal with a personal belief, which I believe can be well substantiated

Minority young people must have role models with whom they can identify.

by educational research, that conflict in and of itself is not necessarily bad. It is from the experience of conflict in our lives that a basis for change is provided. I look upon some conflict as a clash of principles, of ideas, and these are around us all the time. From them we get the impetus to move toward change. We become dissatisfied with the way things are. As a result we look about us and think of better ways of doing things.

An example of conflict in our society in the past few years has been related to the increasing difficulty of obtaining oil. Particularly in California, where the automobile has become a necessity rather than a luxury, we come into conflict with others in terms of the availability of petroleum products and our ready access to them. We have sometimes had to stand in long lines just to fill up our tanks; but as a result of the conflict involved, we are developing new approaches to energy. This might otherwise not have occurred.

Other kinds of conflict can occur in our schools, because we see that when groups of people come together they do not always agree. It does not mean that Party A is correct and Party B is incorrect, but maybe the different approaches suggest that there may be a third way of approaching the problem and finding a solution.

We have had experience in working with schools, in dealing with the problems related to conflict, and in finding techniques and strategies for managing the conflict. In the past couple of years, we have worked on a project that culminated in the publication of a manual called *Improving the Human Environment of Schools.* The manual was distributed to every school district in the state. We also provided a series of workshops and training sessions for school administrators, teachers, and other school staff.

Essentially, we focus on improving the communication skills of all the people who are involved in the operation of schools. We are working toward the improvement of problem-solving techniques.

A number of school districts have requested help in dealing with problems involving the community and members of the school board and various segments of the school staff. We have worked with districts on problems of restructuring the organizational pattern of schools, closing of schools, and developing school desegregation plans.

Essentially, we focus on improving the communication skills of all the people who are involved in the operation of schools.

We also work with agencies within the state government, among them the Department of Fair Employment and Housing. At the federal level we work with the Office for Civil Rights and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. These enforcement agencies become involved with school districts when allegations of discrimination are made. Our role is to serve as an intermediary where we can. If districts are experiencing problems in any of the areas that I have identified and are under scrutiny from any state or federal agency, our function initially is to try to work with the districts to eliminate the cause of the problem. When this fails, of course, then the district has to deal directly with the agency. Our interest is in helping you to eliminate the problem. If you have need of assistance, you know who we are and how to reach us.

GENERAL SESSION FIVE

CITIZENS WHO CAN FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY

Keynote Speaker

Lorenza Calvillo-Craig, Member, California State Board of Education

Public education in the United States has a unique basis in law. In the United States, laws guarantee civil rights, including equal educational opportunity. Freedom, liberty, civil rights, and equal educational opportunity are the foundations of our society. A society needs an educated citizenry if it is to be strong. Our national and state interests depend on the best use of human resources. Education's goal, then, is to develop and maximize the resources found in the people, the people who move through the systems of education. Integrated education and bilingual education offer two of the most effective methods for maximum use of human resources.

National and state interests today require citizens who can live and be productive in a pluralistic society. It is absolutely necessary. I am sure you are as encouraged as I am by the most recent census figures, which show the incredible growth of minority citizens in our state. The Hispanic growth was 90 percent over the last ten years. And black and Asian communities are also growing very rapidly. Therefore, it is not a matter of whether we want to live in a pluralistic society—it is that we do. And we will. No ethnic group can live in this country in isolation. No group has that option. Not Hispanics. Not blacks. Not Anglos. Even if the white suburb or the Chicano barrio or the black ghetto exists, no one stays entirely within those small boundaries.

Integrated education is one of the best methods of teaching and preparing young people to live together effectively. Historically, the curriculum for integrated education has included the study and appreciation of cultures, the contributions of all of the groups which make up our society, human relations training, the involvement of community and parents. Oral history, for example, plays a role in many integrated educational plans. Results of successful integration programs throughout the country have included academic gains for minority children. They also have included academic gains for majority children.

An additional benefit for minority children who are in integrated schools is access to what is called a *network*. Minority children, in the past, may have been isolated in a school with very little fiscal support and curricular support. Those children, in an integrated school, have access to information and contacts with people in a variety of different professions and a variety of different jobs. That is an asset for minority children. They learn about jobs they may never have heard about, or they learn about institutions of higher education they may never have known about. That is very similar to my own experience.

I grew up in the San Joaquin Valley near Fresno in the little town of Selma. I am one of nine children in a farmworker family, and I was the first to go off to college. We did not know what a college was. I do not mean that I did not know where it was, I mean I did not know *what* it was. And my parents did not know what it was, what the experience included. I think it was because of the trust they had in me that when I said I wanted to go to college, they agreed. It is that sort of thing.

Integrated education and bilingual education offer two of the most effective methods for maximum use of human resources.

When I was in graduate school in the 1960s, it used to infuriate me to read the many sociological studies that were published at that time about the lack of support of minority families, particularly Hispanic families, for public education. It just infuriated me to think that sociologists would look at my parents' experience and make the assumption they they did not support higher education—when they did not know what it was. Their support for me was at all times unequivocal. If I wanted to do it, that is what I could

do. But it was a matter of their not having known what higher education was.

One of the greatest benefits that has been demonstrated time and again, in a series of successful integration projects, has been that the children in an integrated school have access to knowledge about a professional world and about experience that they normally would not have had.

Integrated education is sound not only for California, but for the entire nation. The world is getting smaller, and if we are to remain a world leader, a role model, if you will, if we are to be successful with third-world countries (which we now call underdeveloped, but they do have all the natural resources we need), we must use the talent of our third-world citizens. We will remain a leader only through the development of citizens who are effective in third-world communities. Let me say that again. We will be a leader only through the development of citizens, not just minority children, but all of our children, all citizens who learn to be effective in third-world communities.

Bilingual education is a second method that is excellent and necessary for a pluralistic society. We face, in this country, and certainly in California, a language crisis for everyone. I work for the University of California. When I went to Berkeley in 1964, about 6 to 8 percent of the freshman class had to take what used to be called "bonehead English." They do not call it that anymore, but that is what it was called then. In the freshman class at the University of California last fall—and, remember, we take the top 12 ½ percent—50 percent had to take "bonehead English." We have a language crisis, and I am not talking about non-English languages. We have, for whatever reasons—and there are multiple reasons—arrived at a position where we are not dealing with language development well in our public schools.

President Jimmy Carter had a commission, the President's Commission on Foreign Languages. It produced a report that argues that we face a national crisis because of our failure to develop resources of people who speak foreign languages or who are multilingual. That is a serious national crisis. They have some marvelous anecdotes that are funny, but again they are not funny.

When the Premier of the People's Republic of China came to the United States to visit President Carter, our government was unable to locate a single employee who could translate both ways. Now, that is an embarrassment. There was no excuse for that. Our President had to use the interpreter who accompanied the Chinese Premier.

There was another anecdote about an ambassador appointed to a South American country. He was a very nice man, but he did not speak any Spanish. At his first formal reception he was provided with an interpreter. But he wanted personally to relay his sorrow at not being able to speak to them in Spanish. So he promptly proceeded to tell them that he was pregnant.

Integrated education is one of the best methods of teaching and preparing young people to live together effectively.

This is a national crisis. In California and in the United States we need a formal policy of bilingual and multilingual education. We need systems to develop citizens who will function effectively in multilingual communities. In California, we have a gold mine. We have children who are multilingual and multicultural. With this natural resource we could develop an educational system which would be an international model of education. The California model could be envied and copied throughout the world, but it must be a model to teach children and adults to speak many languages.

Today, in this politically conservative era, people often argue that you should teach the primary language only until the child learns English, and then you get rid of that terrible primary language as soon as possible. That is a popular conservative position. I thought a long time about nice things to call it. In English, it is very short-sighted, it is educationally unsound, it is stupid. It is nationally and internationally suicidal to argue that the formal policy we should pursue is that our children should learn English quickly—and only English.

No one I have ever known in the bilingual community has ever argued about the need to learn English. We not only want to learn English, we intend to learn it very well. The issue is whether the purpose is to teach English only and try to eliminate that terrible, awful handicap. It is almost as if the country is suffering collectively from a negative self-concept. This country does not appear to believe in itself. It does not believe it has the capability to develop and deliver bilingual education. But I know better. For a pluralistic society, bilingual education is sound and it is necessary for all children.

The child who is non-English proficient or limited-English proficient has a civil right to bilingual education, but I am talking about a much broader program.

A bilingual education curriculum includes the study and valuing of cultures, the ongoing training of teachers, understanding and respect for languages, and the involvement of parents and community.

In thinking about bilingual education, national and international security becomes important. North America is changing. We are not going to have a common market unless something drastic happens with Canada and Mexico. Those countries feel that, when we had a lot of resources, we were not interested in a common market. Now that we have run short of certain resources, we want a common market.

But, *there will be something different.* North America will shift. Mexico has oil. Spanish is an oil language, and that helps a lot. The United States needs oil. What will we pay for it? When the Mexican government negotiated a deal with Canada for the delivery of oil, the Canadian representative asked what the price would be. The Mexican representative said he did not want dollars. He asked for some very specific technical training teams on a very specific schedule to help the Mexican government with its massive technical development program.

That is what we have to offer as a country. We can pay for the oil or the other natural resources with technical training teams. We now buy about 60 percent of Mexico's oil, and that government, quite frankly, wants to bring that down to about 50 percent. Mexico would prefer to have several large buyers. But even at 50 percent, what we have to buy the oil with—the natural resources—is technical knowledge. We have people who can assist Mexico in its development, and those people must be bilingual.

If we are to maintain our strength as a nation, it will not be with the behavior of the past. That is my projection. In the past, we had Anglo ambassadors proud that they did not speak the language of the country to which they were assigned. I do not believe that we will move into the next stage of our role as a world leader with that kind of behavior.

The exciting thing is that California can prepare bilingual citizens. We can add the strength of California to this nation. An additional factor on the side of bilingual education for all children is that that is where the jobs are. It is simple. State jobs, county jobs, city jobs, employment in hospitals, private companies, private industry—the market for people who are bilingual is growing very rapidly. As a member of the State Board of Education, I see report after report showing that profile. Education in this country has always recognized an obligation to prepare people with employment skills. That is something we felt pride in. When people left our schools, they had employment skills. Well, this is an employment area, and it requires an employment skill. It is a skill that private industry, cities, counties, and the federal government are crying for.

That is the opportunity we have. The integration of bilingual education and desegregation programs is very natural. I would be worried if somehow the nature of the two programs was such that it made their integration difficult. I think the only problem in the past has been one of staffing. The bilingual law said you needed ten or more children in a class; if you split them up, then who got the teacher?

I believe, however, that if we aggressively pursue the goal of effective language development with the kind of talent and professional skill and resources we have in California, then the outcome can be an absolute success, not only for the state and the country, but for the world.

Of course, this is a difficult, conservative period of history. I am not unaware of the kinds of problems that you face or that we face together. And things will get worse. But I know that what we pursue in integrated education and bilingual education is sound. It is the way to ensure the future of California's children. I will change my mind about that when I hear somebody criticize John Gavin for speaking Spanish, or when people with money stop preparing their children to speak Spanish. Some legislators who vote aggressively in Sacramento against bilingual education will tell me very proudly of the schools in which they place their children to learn Spanish because that is where the jobs are. So, what we are talking about is ensuring the very future of our children. Ultimately, our obligation as educators is the most complete and effective development of human resources, the guarantee of the civil rights of all children. I leave you with a promise that I will join you and will fight at your side to hell and back—for *all* our children.

Ultimately, our obligation as educators is the most complete and effective development of human resources, the guarantee of the civil rights of all children.

WORK SESSION ONE

MINORITY VIEWS

Moderator

Minta Brown, Consultant, Office of Intergroup Relations, California State Department of Education

Participants

Annie Richardson, Los Angeles; **Herlinda Ramirez,** San Diego; and **Toti de Guzman,** San Diego

Annie Richardson:

I am, at present, a member of an integration team in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Each area in Los Angeles is assigned an integration team. My understanding of the task for this workshop is that we are to present issues and concerns from our particular perspectives.

There are four basic issues, in my estimation, from the black perspective. I would like to share those with you as they relate to the Los Angeles Unified School District from my point of view as a parent in that district. The number one issue is unequal education of blacks and other minorities. Data are available to prove that separate but equal is truly unequal in Los Angeles. The curriculum offered at each grade level is very unequal. When you look at the curriculum offering at an inner-city school and you look at the curriculum offering at a San Fernando Valley school, you can easily see that there is a great disparity.

Another unequal situation involves the plant facility, equipment, and other unmeasurable qualities. One of the things that always bothered me as a parent is, when we start to talk about what is unequal, we only relate equality to having your child sit next to a child of another ethnicity. I think that in the *Brown* decision they talk about unmeasurable values that are involved in desegregation. So, even if you look at the curriculum and the curriculum is the same and you look at the plant and the plant is the same, there are other things in a desegregated setting that come into play.

One of the things that I hope my children learn through their school experience is that all black folks are not the same, all white folks are not the same, and all brown folks are not the same. People are people, and that is something you learn through desegregation that you cannot measure, but it is a fallout of being in a desegregated setting.

The second issue is desegregation as a black/white issue. I think the bottom line is that desegregation is a black/white issue. When we went through the first process of voluntary desegregation, the last to be chosen were the black children. White children usually choose to integrate with any other ethnicity or minority before the black schools are chosen. How do you get all the people involved, including the black/white combination?

The third issue has to do with desegregation versus integration. The court can mandate desegregation, but it cannot mandate integration; and often what happens is that you end up with some kind of token desegregation, or moving of bodies, with no integration. I feel that if you have desegregated and got a mix on the same campus, but students do not intermingle with students of other ethnicities, then the desegregation has not accomplished its goals.

Data are available to prove that separate but equal is truly unequal in Los Angeles. The curriculum offered at each grade level is very unequal.

I think a lot of people outside of our district have perceived the busing plan as massive. In Los Angeles there are very few black children involved in the desegregation plan. When desegregation was initiated, Los Angeles had more then 500,000 students in the district; of that number, only 78,000 were involved in the mandatory pairs and clusters, and of the 78,000, about 32,000 were white and 46,000 were combined

minority. Only 13,000 were black. This was for 1979. In 1980 the number decreased. There were 24,000 white students and 42,000 combined minority students; and of those only 9,000 were black students. To me the whole desegregation plan as it has existed in Los Angeles is not massive at all. I mean that 9,000 black students do not add up to a massive busing plan, as far as I am concerned. Now, those are the pairs and clusters. We have a situation in Los Angeles where they are talking about dismantling the "mandatory" component. But to me it is "mandatory" when the minority students have to go to another school to get a good education.

We have two other components in the desegregation plan. One is called PWT (permits with transportation), which is a voluntary plan. Ninety-eight percent of the children in this plan are black. We have another component called satellite zoning, which affects about 98 percent Hispanic children. It is to relieve overcrowding, and it is one-way busing. So what you do not hear about Los Angeles is the fact that there are large numbers of minority children on the move to integrate white schools on permits with transportation and satellite zoning. When they talk about dismantling the mandatory desegregation plan, to me those components are as mandatory as pairs and clusters, because the students in an overcrowded school do not get to say, "I will not go." They draw a geographic area, and they say your satellite zone is to such and such school. That is mandatory, in my estimation, and that is the part that they do not publicize. There are about 20,000 students involved in PWT, and 98 percent of them are black. In the satellite zones the students are all minority/Hispanic children. About 2 or 3 percent are black students who go to a predominantly Hispanic school.

What bothers me is that, in Los Angeles, we have not started to talk about the real issue. I think the real issue is that there is no difference between what is happening to us as minority parents in Los Angeles and what happened in the South when minority schools were closed and the minority children had to bear the burden of travel. When do we really address the issue of equality for everybody? I mean, if it is okay for me to do it, then it should be okay for everybody to do it. We should share the burden equally.

Herlinda Ramirez:

For us, there is a lot of misunderstanding about this issue. The problem is that we believe our children are not going to be receiving an equal opportunity to have a good education if there is mandatory transportation. I am sorry for my English, but I am not very skilled in this language. I am dominant in Spanish. I hope you can understand me.

My name is Herlinda Ramirez from Mexico. As I said, we have a lot of concerns about our children being taken away from our community. We need a lot of information, and I believe the district is not doing a good job on that. You have a lot of workshops about this, like this one, and are spending a lot of money on this kind of activity, but we do not have this kind, we of the community. I am talking about the parents; the parents are the ones that have to know what has been happening, what is going to happen with the children. We do not know. That is why we have all these concerns. We want to have bilingual education, and we want the security of our communities. We believe that our children are going to be in a foreign atmosphere and that maybe the school personnel are not going to be ready to receive our children. Maybe our children will not have the right kind of school personnel. We are concerned that they are not going to be happy over there. That is why I believe we need to have more information.

. . . There is no difference between what is happening to us as minority parents in Los Angeles and what happened in the South when minority schools were closed and the minority children had to bear the burden of travel.

Toti de Guzman:

I am currently working in San Diego for the Filipino-American Educators Association, which is funded by the federal government as a Title VII project. It deals with bilingual, multicultural education. We are involved with parent training. My background is entirely different from what I am doing now, because I recently retired from the Navy. But I have been exposed to a lot of parents and what their views are, so I feel that I am well prepared in giving my views, since they are the views of the majority of the Filipino people—in my community, anyway.

There is indeed a need for bilingual education among the Filipino people, in spite of the fact that most of the Filipino immigrants are fluent in English. Some are limited-English speaking. The problem these students encounter in the school district is that they are branded as slow learners or mentally retarded. We have had a couple of cases here. So there is indeed

a need for bilingual education, at least to get away from such drastic misclassification of students.

Bilingual education is necessary for Filipinos in the sense that we want to develop our own self-esteem, and in some way bilingual education interrelates with our multicultural education. With bilingual education we somehow are exposed more to the culture of our own language and have an opportunity to maintain our own culture.

In the area of desegregation, indeed, as Annie said, it is still an issue between black and white. Now, we feel that, if we are going to have desegregation, let us do it on a multiethnic basis, so that Filipinos will be exposed to a different culture which has different values. The values of the Chicanos are important for us to learn and accept as a culture. The black culture, which is very rich, is something the Filipino community should also learn and accept. Multicultural, multiethnic desegregation would help us learn to merge, or mesh, into the American mainstream. There is not an American culture, really. The American culture is picked up from many different cultures. Let us have multiethnic desegregation so that each and every one of the cultures will be represented, and then we will learn to accept the differences, to assimilate into the American culture. It has not been that much of a problem in the Filipino community, but we would like to see it. The Filipinos in the San Diego area are spread over the county and throughout the school districts. I would like to see it because I am experiencing it now. My daughter is being bused to a black school. She is enjoying it, and I would like to see more of that.

Minta Brown (Moderator):

Our parent panelists have identified some issues that are of particular interest, especially in their references to the necessity of multicultural education in order for people to interact and interrelate and reach an understanding. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about multicultural education and what it really is.

As our presenters have mentioned, we need to realize that we have entrusted to us the fate of our society and the preservation of our culture, with the responsibility of having an influence on almost every citizen. The public school, or some form of education, is a common denominator. Family styles may be different. There may be one- or two-parent homes, rich or poor homes, but children are going to be educated, so those who provide that education need to have some common understanding. The American culture is a culture that has been contributed to by hundreds of cultures—and that is the American culture.

When we talk about cultural diversity, we are talking about some generalized understanding that must be specifically interpreted. And when we do that specific interpretation, we are talking about human relations, and that can only happen when people come together and those humans are addressed as individuals. And if we are saying we cannot do it because people do not share language, or if we cannot do it because we cannot provide transportation, then we have a problem that must begin with commitment. I think that all of our speakers today have been talking about what kind of commitment are we going to develop, and how can we take the information that we have been given and go back and make a difference.

I think Herlinda is saying that the parents want to be sure that the children are being received as human beings, that their needs are being met on an individual basis, and that the school is prepared to receive them.

The American culture is a culture that has been contributed to by hundreds of cultures—and that is the American culture.

Question: What kinds of information do you feel you have not been receiving, and from whom would you like to receive that information?

Herlinda Ramirez:

We would like to receive the information from the district. We would like to know what kind of programs they are going to be providing to our children since in our neighborhoods, in our schools, they already have programs. What is going to happen if they are going to be moved to that other school? We would like to know the kind of programs, how the programs will be implemented, and what kind of personnel are in that school. We would like to have that information in our native language. For example, I would like to have it in Spanish, because I am dominant in that language, and in that way I can understand what is going to happen with my children in that school, what kind of atmosphere they are going to be surrounded with, the attitude of the teachers, and the attitude of the administrators.

WORK SESSION TWO

BUILDING A SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION WITHIN AN INTEGRATED SCHOOL

Daniel Holt, Mario Muniz, and **Maria Vasquez,** Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education

Mario Muniz:

I am a consultant with the NOD-LAU unit in the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education. I would like to introduce my colleagues from the NOD-LAU unit in Sacramento. To my left are Maria Vasquez and Dan Holt.

What I would like to do is briefly give you the overview of what we intend to do today in the session. I must add that we have changed the basic plan that we used yesterday because of the shortage of time and the extensive content of our presentation. This is done specifically to allow you the opportunity to participate in the discussion so that we can find out what some of your concerns are and try to address them during our presentation.

Now I will walk you through the contents of the handouts that we hav for you. There is some very valuable information that you really should take the time at your own leisure to review. We will be referring to much of this information during the presentation. On the left side, the first information item is a summary of the language census for 1980. Basically, this is the language information that is collected by the Department through our Data/Bical unit within the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education.

Next, we have the 1979 racial and ethnic survey conducted by the Office of Intergroup Relations. Beneath that is a copy of the memorandum issued from the Office of Intergroup Relations addressing the impact of Proposition 1 on desegregation. We have also included for your information an advisory from the Department of Education which addresses the relationship between proficiency standards for graduation and bilingual education. This advisory was prepared jointly by the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education and the Office of Program Evaluation and Research.

You also have in your packet a blue sheet, which describes TRI-LAU, the coordination network among the three Lau centers in California. You will also find a summary of the federal and state requirements for bilingual education. It is set up in chronological order for your information in developing a good understanding of the legal requirements for bilingual education. Next, we have the background statement on bilingual education, a document that has been developed by the Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education in Sacramento. This statement outlines the standards of quality, and the theoretical framework for bilingual education. I really need to emphasize that the framework was developed from a thorough review of current research, something we will be referring to during the presentation.

The last item is a paper that has been written by Jane Mercer, entitled "Building Effective Multiethnic Schools." This is the document that Dan Holt will be referring to in his presentation.

Daniel Holt, Consultant, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education

The title of this session deals with developing a support system. This support system should meet the needs of all students: their linguistic, academic, and psychosocial needs within the school setting. When you begin to look at developing a system, you have to look at a variety of things. While we will focus on bilingual education in some detail and while that certainly is our area of expertise, we are committed to contextualizing bilingual education so that it exists as an important approach for not only language-minority students but also other ethnic-minority students and all students in the school.

I believe that bilingual education should become an integrative vehicle and I hope that, as we begin to talk more about this system for developing support in language achievement and psychosocial development, you will see what we mean by bilingual education as an integrative vehicle.

Let us start by looking at what happens characteristically in an interethnic situation. What happens when a minority and a nonminority student interact in the

school setting? Many of the points that we will be discussing this morning come from Jane Mercer's work on building effective multiethnic schools. Dr. Mercer's work indicates that in a normal encounter in a school setting between minority and nonminority students, we find patterns that replicate events in the larger society; namely, that the majority student takes over the interaction, dominates the interaction, and initiates more activity. The minority student is left in a subservient position.

Dr. Cohen's work at Stanford, which involved observing the interactions between black and white students, really substantiates this point dramatically.

I believe that bilingual education should become an integrative vehicle . . . .

She designed an experiment where a black student and a white student, matched on IQ measures, sat down to work out the problem of putting a radio together. The black student was taught in advance how to assemble the radio, and it was known that the white student did not know how. When they sat down and the teacher instructed them to put the radio together, the black student did not initiate the activity, did not assist in the activity, but allowed the white student to take over and figure out the solution. The black student really became a subordinate in the interaction. And this proved to be the pattern throughout the experiment.

Others have observed situations where the differential prestige and status accorded to minority and majority students in a larger society is replicated in the schools.

In a team situation someone is going to come out a little more subordinate than the other in any kind of activity. But if this happens on a predictable basis, if it happens always that the minority student plays the subservient role, then I think that a problem is created that we all would like to rectify.

This problem has an impact on achievement in very important ways. First, it reduces the interaction between the student and teacher. It reduces the amount of information that the minority student can learn and the amount of experience the minority student can benefit from. It also reinforces a feeling of inadequacy. In some cases we can see that it actually creates social disability, with students becoming hostile with one another or even preferring not to enter into this interaction in the first place. What is the point in trying to cooperate if one always comes out looking foolish or looking unqualified? By increasing the student's negative affective reactions, the subordinate role limits the assimilation of information and limits the interaction itself.

This subservient role also reduces the time in which the student can be on task in participating if the student really stays out and does not actively participate. If time on task is reduced, the amount of learning that takes place is also reduced. As Dr. Mercer points out in her research, once the learning is reduced and the achievement is reduced, the teacher's negative expectations of minority students are triggered.

Contrary to many other studies, race itself does not seem to be a very good predictor of how teachers feel about the ability of certain students. According to Dr. Mercer, it does not matter whether the student is brown, black, or white. The critical variable, in terms of how the teacher feels about the student's ability to succeed in the school, depends on how the student is actually achieving. If the student is learning, is participating, and is getting good marks, the teacher has very confident feelings about the student's ability to succeed in society, about the student's ability to interact with other students, and about the student's positive interpersonal relationships. According to Dr. Mercer, achievement is what triggers the positive or negative attitudes toward a student and not entirely the ethnicity of the student.

I think this may tell us something about why teachers have positive attitudes toward certain groups and negative perceptions of others. It may not be because the group is Asian per se, but because those students may bring more to a situation, which allows them to achieve. Then, because of the achievement, the teacher thinks they are doing great, which perpetuates the student's high achievement. Once the achievement is affected by the differential status that is accorded to students and is affected by their differential involvement in the interaction, then the negative attitudes are triggered, and the low achievement is perpetuated.

So what do we do about this? Dr. Mercer proposes a series of affirmative programs and affirmative steps for administrators, teachers, educators—everyone associated with the education of the child. These steps would, in effect, overtly increase the status that is accorded to students in the school setting. In order to break down differential treatment that is largely the result of the different status accorded to students (based arbitrarily on their language and cultural background), we need to do certain things in the school setting that will increase the status of minority students. This should result in relative equity across all

student groups. That is another way of looking at equity.

We all want to achieve equity, but really what does that mean? It involves overt activities in the school setting that will counterbalance what may be going on outside the school that is often replicated in the school setting with students feeling inadequate just because they are minority students.

What we hope to do during this presentation is to outline some things within the school setting that could be done that would result in increased perceptions of status, or, as Dr. Mercer terms it, "status equalization." These things must be done in ordinary daily pursuits at the school site. They cannot be reserved for once a month for ethnic holidays or once a year for prominent figures' birthdays. They cannot be done in an isolated classroom for certain students while excluding others. They have to happen in normal day-to-day activities where students realize repeatedly that teachers and administrators are sincere about their efforts to accord prestige to all students' unique characteristics. They should happen in natural, comfortable situations in their regular interactions done in a way that matches students' needs.

I want to emphasize that status equalization must happen with the full support of the administration. Minority students' prestige often is accorded as a result of one instructional aide or one teacher, maybe an enlightened principal, or a group of enlightened teachers. But what has to happen is that status equalization has to be an overt policy and practice which

I want to emphasize that status equalization must happen with the full support of the administration.

becomes institutionalized. That is, the administration must try to recreate the structure of the school in a way that will make all students feel that they are insiders whether they just arrived, whether they have been there for a long period of time, whether they are the declining population, or whether they are the group that is rapidly increasing.

Building this sense of togetherness is extremely critical in this status equalization effort. We are dealing with the perceptions of all students, not just the perceptions of the minority students. Our educational interventions have traditionally focused on the minority student with special needs. Dr. Cohen's experiment mentioned earlier would indicate that we also have to deal with nonminority students' perceptions of minority students in order to establish cooperation in the learning environment. Students must see that it is in their individual interests to cooperate rather than compete. And certainly as we get into curriculum and

. . . Status equalization has to be an overt policy and practice which becomes institutionalized.

instruction, one way to foster this change would be to make the evaluation of the students' performance contingent upon their ability to cooperate rather than just their ability to solve the task as individuals. If nonminority students see that they can just intervene, show how great they are, and get good grades for doing so, they are not going to be motivated to subordinate their own initiative in order to work out cooperative solutions.

In looking at building a support system, one of the things that we need to do is actually envision what the system looks like. One of the problems that we have had is that we have looked at individual programs and their success or failure in achieving desired educational outcomes, but we have not looked at those programs precisely enough in terms of the context in which they operate. So we get all kinds of questions: Is Title I working or not? Is bilingual education working or not? Is it effective or not?

We need to look at how a program is doing in relation to the entire system. The system can be envisioned by looking at what our office has crudely constructed as an interaction model which delineates a way of looking at a group of factors which affect educational outcomes. Instruction is the one factor that we are usually concerned with. Instruction, bilingual education, and remedial reading are certainly important. But another aspect is the student input factors; e.g., the student's language proficiency. Do we really have a good way of measuring the student's proficiency? Do we have a real understanding of what that proficiency is? If black students come to school, do teachers have an accurate perception of their linguistic development? Or do they just say these students speak a dialect of English and what we have to do is to teach them how to use standard English? Or do we have a more thorough understanding of language acquisition in terms of what students really know?

The work of William Labov has been very persuasive in indicating that *how* you assess students determines much of what you really find out about them.

For example, one tester sat down with one black student who was very proficient in one variety of what could be called Black English; yet the student was diagnosed as having a learning disability and of being "alingual." Another tester, however, had a thorough understanding of black language and could use black language to elicit responses. With this assessor the student readily and actively participated, revealing a sophisticated linguistic capacity.

Educational input factors involve the way the program is organized; whether the local board of education has adopted a policy regarding equity for all students; whether it has a policy on institutionalizing programs designed to meet the special needs of individual groups of children; whether there is an affirmative policy to staff the program with individuals with a variety of ethnic backgrounds. These kinds of factors very critically affect the way the treatment is organized, which in turn affects community background factors. Community background factors include things like the way the community perceives the school and the degree of community involvement in the school through participation, observation, consultation, and so forth.

All of these factors interact with and affect each other. For example, in bilingual education if there is an affirmative policy on accepting the child's first language as the language of instruction, this policy will certainly affect the way parents in the minority community view the school. The interaction runs both ways and is highly dynamic. In this way we can see the need for educators to learn techniques for managing these factors. We must recognize that we have control over many of these factors. For example, do we have enough teachers who can teach reading to students with different dialects and languages? We say we cannot find them. Well, do we have a program for those teachers to work in if we could find them? Do we have a policy that says that we are desperately in need of them? If we have a commitment to find them, they suddenly start appearing. One of the encouraging things that we found out about the Asian and Minority Language Project in our office was that once we made a commitment to develop handbooks on 13 Asian and minority languages, we found an impressive network of individuals who have become important resources for the project.

Once you make the commitment, you find the support. People find out about the need, and individuals become available. This in turn reinforces the policy, which then supports the treatment and ultimately the educational outcomes.

What we would like to see is this kind of a model used in the initial development of a program (i.e., designing the goals and objectives) as well as in the implementation and evaluation of the program. During the evaluation of the outcomes, we can then begin to identify where additional manipulation and management are necessary to improve that outcome or to sustain the improvement that we already have.

Once you make the commitment, you find the support. People find out about the need, and individuals become available.

In bilingual education we have this model developed in some detail regarding standards of implementation. In your packet you have a background statement on bilingual education that does outline the critical variables in the assessment, in the program, in the community, and in the school. This has been developed over the past two years. What we are now at work on, partially as a result of this conference, is identifying additional factors as they relate to other students in the school setting and as they relate to other factors in the school. In other words, development of the child's literacy in the first language is one factor that affects achievement in English. But what about the factor of having a multiethnic staff? Is that a significant factor in affecting the treatment or the outcome? What about involving nonminority students in the bilingual program? Is the enrollment of nonminority students in a bilingual program a critical factor in affecting the outcome? Does it improve the interaction of students and thereby improve achievement? That is what we are working on now, primarily with Jane Mercer. It is going to be the focus of our work for the next year at least. That is about as far as we can plan ahead with funding at this time. But we are excited about the possibilities and about getting your reaction to this approach. We are moving in the direction of being able to provide a system on developing a program with certain additional standards of implementation.

A bilingual teacher in a self-contained classroom with good materials is one of many very important factors that determine whether students actually benefit from that program. However, we have to look at other factors: the interaction of that student in that self-contained classroom with other students in the school; active, equitable participation in a multiethnic

environment; adoption at the highest level of support in the administration for that self-contained classroom; active parent involvement in not only signing off on the proposal but coming into that classroom participating, evaluating, and then consulting with the administration. We want to be able to say more about these myriad variables. But we want to be very careful that when we talk about them that, just as in the background statement, we speak from a position of confidence that the research supports the fact that these factors really *do* make a difference.

References

Labov, William. "The Logic of Nonstandard English," in *Language and Cultural Diversity in American Education.* Edited by R.D. Abrahams and R.C. Troike. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Mercer, J.R.; P. Iadicola; and H. Moore, "Building Effective Multiethnic Schools," in *School Desegregation: Past, Present, and Future.* Edited by W. G. Stephan and J. R. Feagin. New York: Plenum Publishing Corp., 1980.

Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework. Developed by the Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1981.

WORK SESSION THREE

BUILDING PROGRAMS THAT WORK

Patricia Gandara, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica

I will not talk about districts that I think are doing a good job, but rather about factors that I think contribute to doing a good job. I will offer examples of some interesting things that have been done in districts around the country.

One of the most interesting questions is really embedded in the title itself; that is, What do we mean by programs that work? I do not think there is one kind of a program that works or one kind of a model that we can disseminate around the country and say, "This is a great model; use it in all the districts and you will have a very good program."

I am just finishing some work right now—data collection—on a national perspective, looking at different kinds of what I have called language assistance programs because some districts do not call them bilingual programs. I am convinced that different districts need different kinds of programs. What works for one place may not work for another. This is a theme that I will keep returning to in my comments. There is just a great variety of what can be done, depending on the needs of communities and what people want.

I want to share some of what I have gained from going around the country observing different kinds of programs, talking with parents, the recipients of the programs, and the people who deliver the programs. I will describe some of the things that I think contribute to successful programs.

Programs that work are programs that respond to the needs of communities. If a program is to be responsive, it needs to take into account the tremendous differences that exist in our communities.

We often tend to see bilingual education as a purely Spanish-English phenomenon. Many communities have more than one major language group. The other groups have not only a right to services but they have a need and a desire for them. A program will never be really effective unless everybody is involved in it. We must serve the whole population.

Some differences that affect the workability of programs concern the developmental stages of different language groups. Most of the research and most of the literature focus on Spanish as the other language in a bilingual setting. Most of the focus in districts is on Hispanics. The resources, materials, and know-how for a bilingual education program in Spanish are available. Other language groups do not have the resources, materials, or teaching staff. But these groups must be served also. Their needs must be assessed, and the districts must address those needs in some effective manner.

This may be *the* most important factor—programs have to serve communities and have to serve the different people in the communities. I have seen districts in which the district is overwhelmingly Hispanic and the programs are run by Hispanics. This may or may not work well. I have seen other districts in which there is a great division demographically. A district may have many whites, many blacks, and two or three different language minority groups. Things have to work differently in such a district.

I am convinced that different districts need different kinds of programs. What works for one place may not work for another.

Also, there is a legitimate basis for attempting to make workable programs based on historical precedence. I will get into what I mean by this in the examples. In some communities there exists an historical legitimacy for the use of Spanish as a second language. That is something we have to pay attention to.

A second important factor in making a program work is that the program must not be threatening. Nothing is more damaging to a working program than a community that feels threatened by that program. Here is where desegregation plays a very important role.

I would go beyond saying that bilingual education and desegregation can coexist. I would make the intrepid statement that bilingual education programs may work best in desegregated settings, that desegregation may be the best thing in the world for bilingual education. When bilingual programs belong to only one section of the community or when communities are segregated so that all the bilingual programs are on one side of town, then the other people and the other students in the district do not relate to those programs.

This can provide a very threatening sort of atmosphere. When the people do not understand what is going on, they begin to feel that a lot of money is being poured into another section of town for some kind of special program that they are not getting. Some white people get very uptight about that because they feel the money is being misspent. Some black people get very uptight about that because they think there are other problems that need to be dealt with and that money is being spent in one section and it is not being spread around. Many threatening things can happen.

When you desegregate communities, when you bring bilingual education into all sections of the district, besides reducing suspicion about those programs, you increase contact with those programs. People understand them better. They know what is going on. You also increase the possibilities for monitoring those programs. When those programs exist in only one pocket of the district, monitoring is not as effective. People are not able to see what the effects of those programs are and are not able to correct wrongs as easily as when they are spread throughout the district and everybody can see what is happening.

For those reasons, I think desegregation can be very good for bilingual education. If we were to look at it from that positive perspective, we could promote both desegregation and bilingual education very effectively. The most workable bilingual programs have been in communities that are well educated. A big problem that good programs face is lack of community understanding of what is going on in those programs. Teachers tell me that when they were finally able to get the parents into the classroom, when they were able to show them what was going on there, then the parents became supportive of the program.

The lack of contact between the community and the programs has been a problem in places where very good programs exist. Teachers talk about the need to dispel myths—that often, even in an Hispanic community, there is a very strong feeling that bilingual education means Spanish only, that children are not learning English, that they are not learning as well as the other students, and that they are not getting the same curriculum as the other students. A well-educated community is a very important factor in programs that work.

Another important factor is a school district governing board that truly represents its constituents. It is difficult to have a successful program when the governing board does not represent the district's students. It happens much too often that, even when the majority of students are minority students, there may be no minority members on the board.

A program will never be really effective unless everybody is involved in it. We must serve the whole population.

You do not necessarily have to have a minority board in order to represent minority interests, but it helps. It might guarantee at least a little bit of representation. It is very hard for a program to work when the recipients have to explain to the governing board why they need the program. It helps a lot to have people on the board who know why the program is needed, so they can get beyond that point and talk about how to make the program better.

In districts where programs work well, there is a coherent philosophy about what the district is doing and a very strong direction that is given from the top. I think that is really important. I have seen individual schools that are very good, that are doing fantastic things, and that have a very committed staff. They have a principal who really wants to do something. Another school may have a few good classrooms, but most of them are not doing too well. That generally is the case in districts where there is no coherent philosophy.

When you ask one person, "What do you think the bilingual program is trying to do?" you might get an answer like, "Well, we have a maintenance approach here, and we are trying to help children get into English, but we are also trying to help them maintain their Spanish." You ask a principal and the principal says, "No, this is a transition program; we are trying to get students as quickly as possible into English." And, when you ask a third person and receive yet another answer, you soon find that there is no coherent philosophy in that district. Nobody seems to be sending messages, strong messages, down from the top.

When there is a strong philosophy, when the governing board seems to be in agreement with the principals and the principals seem to be in agreement with the teachers, you find better programs throughout the district rather than spotty kinds of programs that depend completely on the quality of the teachers and their ability to have a good program in the absence of support.

The last point I would like to make is that, in the effective programs I have seen, there has been more of a philosophy of bilingual education as enrichment as opposed to bilingual education as remediation. I think it is amazing how far such a philosophy can go in shaping the workability of a program. When district administrators view their bilingual programs as being remedial programs, programs for students who do not do well, or programs for potential dropouts, then the students who end up in the programs are stigmatized. Other people are not too interested in those programs. The community as a whole sees the bilingual programs as a part of special education. You know, it is the "unfortunates" who end up there. And the community keeps its distance.

> ***. . . In the effective programs I have seen, there has been more of a philosophy of bilingual education as enrichment as opposed to bilingual education as remediation.***

When the district has the philosophy that the bilingual program is an enrichment program, an opportunity for everybody to participate—for Hispanics to learn something more about their own language while they are learning English or for other members of the community to learn something about Spanish while they are learning more in their own language—you will see greater participation of the community. There will be more contact, and everybody will be more interested. I have seen communities in which the biggest crisis that has occurred is that the white students complain bitterly that they cannot get into the programs. And this is the only complaint they have.

Philosophy is important; however, the philosophy must be coherent. It must permeate the district, and it must start with a governing board that is responsive, that is representative of its constituents, and that follows through all the way down into the classroom, with the idea that what is being done in the classroom is something positive, something more, something extra, not just a stopgap measure.

The importance of the factors I have mentioned is that, if those things do not exist in a district, a staff can spend an awful lot of time putting out fires. I think that is a very sad thing. You have qualified people who want to do a good job and who are qualified to do a good job, but they cannot do it because most of their time is spent trying to sell the program and trying to keep people from cutting back funds. They do not get to put all of their energies into doing what they know how to do best. When those factors are present in a district, when they are there and they are firmly embedded, the teachers and the people involved in the programs do not have to worry about public relations. The programs become institutionalized, and the staff can concentrate on quality.

Now I will tell you about a couple of interesting ways of dealing with bilingual education in very different settings. I will not mention the names of the districts, but I will describe them a bit. One was a large metropolitan district in the Midwest. It is a district in which there is a strong tradition, a strong history of multiethnic groups. The district has, over the years, served waves of different language speakers—Poles, Germans, Lithuanians, and now a large group of Puerto Ricans. The schools have had to accommodate each one of these groups as it has come through.

The district is under a federal order to provide bilingual services. One of the interesting things they are doing is to provide immersion classes in French and German, and many of the participants are black. They take all their subjects in one of those languages. Because it is an immersion program, by the time they finish third grade, they are bilingual in English and German or English and French.

One of the ongoing complaints about bilingual education is that, if children do not get enough English, they are not going to learn how to speak English. Well, these children are not getting any English. They are getting French and German, and the community is delighted.

This has been an opportunity to bring black parents and their children into the bilingual process in a very enrichment-oriented way. People are standing in line for these programs. People want to be in bilingual education. They want to participate. They see it as a real plus.

Now, of course, this is different. This is not dealing with the child who just came from Mexico and does not speak English. But it, too, is bilingual education. My feeling is the more we begin to explore different ways of seeing bilingual education and different ways of approaching it from an enrichment perspective, the more support there is going to be in the total community.

Another district that I found fascinating was a district in the Southwest in a small city that has very strong historical roots. The very foundations of the city are Hispanic. People move there because they want to have this historical feeling and live in a place whose tradition and character go back 300 years. Biculturalism is so important to the people in this community that the real thrust for the bilingual program came from the Anglo community. Because there is so much intermarriage, the proportion of Anglos to Mexican-Americans is difficult to measure.

One of the interesting things they are doing is to provide immersion classes in French and German, and many of the participants are black.

The community support for bilingual education is such that the district is having to dig deep into its own pockets to pay for the programs. The community wants the bilingual programs before it wants other things. The superintendent and the community are in agreement that their program is one of enrichment.

Essentially, the program's aim was to produce bicultural children. They admitted freely that they did not feel they could make Anglo children completely bilingual. In an hour or two a day, the children will not become fluent in Spanish. They hope to embed a seed in these children so they will have an appreciation for the language and, as they get older and as more opportunities are open to them by the time they are twenty or twenty-five, they will be bilingual. They will go to college or study the language on their own. They will mix with people who speak Spanish, and they will increase their own skills. Interestingly, because of the intermarriage in that community, many of the Hispanics do not speak Spanish.

The third district I want to mention is one that is very different from the first two. It also is in the Southwest, but in a border area. It is a fairly large district for a border city and 95 percent of the population speaks Spanish. When the children come to school, very few of them speak English. The superintendent in that district has very strongly supported the concept of bilingual education. He has been at the forefront in fighting for it in his state. However, he has had to accommodate his thinking to his particular community. Virtually all the teachers are bilingual.

The parents have a great concern that if the program that is offered is a full bilingual program with a strong maintenance portion, when will these students ever hear English? They hear English only at school. So the parents have asked the schools to please back off on the strong maintenance aspect. Their children will never have to worry about not speaking Spanish. What they have to worry about is not speaking English. This, of course, will limit their economic opportunities.

So here is another perspective on bilingual education. This is a district in which, I think, there is a strong and coherent philosophy. The superintendent could not be more committed to doing a good job for children. Yet he is not going to have a maintenance program because that is not what his community needs. He is trying to adapt his program to the community in which he works.

I think these three examples provide very different perspectives on doing a good job and having a program that works.

WORK SESSION FOUR

CALIFORNIA: THE REALITY

Alberto Ochoa, Director, National Origins Desegregation Center, San Diego State University

I would like to begin by summarizing some of the earlier comments made on the question of equity and by giving you my personal opinion as to how equity has been defined or is being defined by the courts and other agencies and institutions. Then I want to refer to the demographic overview of California in terms of student population over the last ten years, specifically for the period of 1967—1977, as it relates to the achievement of minority students in California. Third, I will deal with educational planning in order to address the projected linguistic and academic needs of minority students in this state.

Most of the philosophical arguments on the subject of equity are for equity in terms of need or in terms of morality or merit; need being the intent of equity, morality being the value position of the community or society, and merit being the actual practice between the intent and the operation of the concept of equity. Regarding the sociopolitical response to need in terms of equity, we have to consider legal intent. The legal requirements for equity are found in the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution; Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, which deals with sex equity; and the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974. In a nutshell, the requirements say that there shall be no discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex.

The educational response for the most part has been focused on the concept of equal educational opportunity, and this is addressed from a deficit perspective. The memorandum of May 25, 1970, deals with taking affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiencies of students.

Generally, we recognize that something needs to be done in terms of equity, to provide equal educational opportunity for students, but on the whole we are saying that the student has either a cultural or linguistic deficit when he or she comes to school. That is the legal basis. As progressive as it might be, this is what we now have that we can use as educators in our rationale for equity.

The next issue is the value position of our society. Have we really internalized the concept of equity in terms of the legal responsibility to address the academic and linguistic needs of students? When we look at national values, we only need to refer to 1896, the year of the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* decision of the Supreme Court, which established the "separate but equal" doctrine. It was not until 1954 that our courts stated that the "separate but equal" doctrine was unconstitutional. Only 26 years ago as a nation we changed the value position and said that we have to provide equal educational opportunity to students.

The legal requirement is that every individual residing in this country should have equal protection under the law. In terms of the educational response, basically it has been to provide access to cultural and structural assimilation as defined by the power structures of our society. We are not saying that we should maintain the culture, background, and language of certain students. We are simply saying that we need to provide them with equal access so they can be mainstreamed into our communities. The thrust is that of assimilation, not of cultural pluralism.

As a society we are still trying to define what we mean by equity. Whether or not bilingual education is the right of a child is still being debated. As for racial segregation, in California the value position of our communities is that of freedom of choice. Is the community to be given the responsibility to decide? Generally, racial segregation has been the responsibility of the schools. We need to address the equality of educational opportunities for all children, but we must not violate the rights of any individual. The question of

The legal requirement is that every individual residing in this country should have equal protection under the law.

institutional, societal equity versus individual rights has not been resolved. In other words this is the question of racism versus the rights of an individual. In the *Bakke* decision, the courts said that the individual (specifically, Bakke) had the right to due process. In the schools we have equal educational access. So, as a society, we are still trying to define the concept of equity. As of this date, a child has a right to equal access to education. The next question concerns benefits, whether the child, by being given equal access, is enabled to profit from the services being provided.

At this time I would like to introduce to you Tom Foote, who will provide us with an overview of some of the research done by the Social Equity Center at San Diego State University with regard to demographic characteristics of California.

(Tom Foote then presented and discussed a series of slides with graphic and tabular material from the publications *Ethnic Groups and Public Education in California* and *Ethnic Groups and Student Achievement in California.* To obtain these research reports, write to Tom Foote, Social Equity Center, 6363 Alvarado Court, Suite 226, San Diego, CA 92120; telephone 714-265-6403 or 265-6692. Ask for prices before ordering copies.)

WORK SESSION FIVE

WHAT HURTS AND WHAT HELPS

Nicelma King, Researcher, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica

As a researcher at the Rand Corporation during the past eight years, I have been involved in five of the six studies done on desegregation for the Civil Rights Commission, the U.S. Office of Education, and the National Institute of Education. In the course of that work I have had the opportunity to visit 118 desegregated or desegregating school districts around the country. I have been asked to visit some of the school districts to conduct staff development. I was a member of the monitor and review committee that was appointed by a Superior Court judge in Los Angeles.

What I want to talk about first are the social and attitudinal conditions that make or break desegregation efforts and bilingual education programs. Some social conditions can be changed; others cannot be changed. I am going to focus more on the former, because to continue talking about things one cannot change is depressing.

In Los Angeles, however, we have given quite a bit of time to talking about things that do not seem to be able to be changed right now. In that category we have political realities, attitudes of board members, and the kinds of exploitation of minority people that tend to occur. In many instances that exploitation is what brought us to the point of needing school desegregation or needing bilingual education.

One must work with whatever racial composition one has in a school district as a whole. When school districts begin to be predominantly minority, it becomes more difficult to desegregate them, and it becomes more difficult to talk about allocating resources. But these things cannot be changed. Another thing we are not usually able to change, although we might be able to modify it somewhat by grant writing, is the amount of money available for programs. One of the things we have found to be very difficult in school districts is that at the time desegregation occurs there are a lot of other interests that are competing for the same amount of money.

All of a sudden people recognize that schools that have been unequal for years are not good enough to send white children to. All of a sudden people recognize that children who have never had the proper attention to their linguistic need are not going to be able to function in integrated classrooms. Now, they were not functioning in segregated classrooms with those same linguistic difficulties, but all of a sudden there is more attention to those things, and they cost money.

All of a sudden people recognize that schools that have been unequal for years are not good enough to send white children to.

Quite often what we have in a school district is an inability to divert the line-item expenditures to provide for the real needs of minority children, although those children may make up the bulk of the school district population. When there is an inability on the part of the board to do that, minority groups end up competing for the available funds. It tends to make for bad feeling between groups, and it tends to create invidious discussions about who has the most "ins" with the superintendent or the board members. Usually, the net result is that those who have real needs never get as much as they really deserve.

The first things that can be changed are the attitudes about the programs themselves; that is, attitudes about desegregation, attitudes about bilingual education, what it is for, what it is going to accomplish, what the real aims are.

The second thing that can be altered or that we consider mutable is a lack of knowledge or information about the goals of the programs and how they operate. (When I say "programs," it is shorthand for both desegregation and bilingual education. When I start to give examples, I will discuss both, separately and together.)

Another thing that can be changed is the fears that people have. Fears are different from attitudes. Attitudes come from the experience of something or from opinions about what it might be like. Fears are much more deep-seated; they sometimes color our attitudes. Fears are things that people hold very close to them, and often it takes very skillful digging to get at what the real fear is that, for example, colors an attitude that might be called "antibusiness." Another thing that can be changed is the exclusion of isolated groups from the process of decision making.

Let us begin with attitudes about the programs; for example, in the Hispanic community about bilingual education, in the black community about desegregation. There is not, by any means, consensus in the white community. I do not think minority communities are different in that respect.

People often do not have any concept of what the programs are. They think bilingual education means that children will not learn to speak English; they think desegregation means that children will lose services.

I am not saying that that cannot happen, but I am saying that these are attitudes or ideas people hold that have to do with their experiences. What they have heard, what they have read about, perhaps their fears, and these are things that you can work around. You can provide more information to people about what bilingual education does and can do.

Right now we are doing a study of bilingual education in eight school districts around the country. There is no bilingual program I have ever heard of that does not have as one of its primary goals instruction in English. All bilingual programs intend to teach children to read and to speak English. (I think true bilingual programs also teach children who speak only English to read and speak another language, but that seems to be a revolutionary concept these days.)

People are concerned about what is going to happen to their children.

Another thing we can change is the lack of knowledge or information about the program. In one school district where there was a desegregation effort, the biggest problem was getting information about the operation of the program out to the people who would be affected. People are concerned about what is going to happen to their children. That is natural and is one of the reasons we have to be very careful. For example, when court orders are issued in the middle of the school year to change how services are to be provided, something very detrimental can happen if people do not understand what is taking place.

Not everybody reads the newspaper or listens to the radio. Those of you who are teachers are aware, I am sure, that those little notices we send home with the children often do not get there. Even if there has been an effort to get information out, there is still a lot of ignorance in the community about how each child is going to be affected by a change.

I will now discuss fears. We are all much more comfortable with people who are like us than with people who are not like us. But it is through learning about people who are not like us that we grow. Yet there is a lot of threat associated with that.

Anglo parents, in many instances, have fears about their children going to ghetto schools. Those fears do not all have to do with the perceived quality of education in those schools; some of the fears have to do with what I consider a vast, fundamental Negrophobia in this country. One hundred years after the abolition of slavery, white America is still very much afraid of black people as a fact of life. Many white parents hold that fear very close to them in their hearts, and they will not admit it. You will never get anyone up front in a mixed group to admit that is what is behind their concern about school desegregation, but it does exist.

I think there is also a fear of foreign or non-English-speaking people in this country. I went to school in Los Angeles, and for many years I rode the bus out to California State, Los Angeles, from the west side of Los Angeles through downtown all the way to East Los Angeles. The comments that I heard about people who did not speak English from the people who only knew English really reflected a great deal of fear—the fear that there were secrets, that something was being hidden from them. These are things that people do not talk about to people of other groups, but I think they have to be talked about and have to be brought out in the open if we are ever going to make bilingual education and desegregation work.

One of the reasons minority people fear or have negative attitudes toward desegregation or bilingual education is that they have not been included in the design of the program. They were brought into the picture only when the plan was a finished thing. Their endorsement was asked—either their endorsement because they were going to be saying yes, the minority community has signed off on this, or their tacit endorsement because they were going to be sending the

most precious thing they had into that program, whether it was desegregation or bilingual education, every day. That is not the way to educate people; nor is it the way to gain their cooperation and trust.

What happens when people have been excluded from the planning process is that you do not have their trust. You will not be able to convince people that their school district, which has been discriminating against the children all along, is now going to provide something wonderful and grand to make it all better.

Now, the converse would seem to be that there are factors that block one's ability to overcome poor attitudes, fear, ignorance, and exclusion (or isolation), and that is the heart of this discussion. I am going to talk about the blocking factors. These are (1) secrecy, which is one of the prime blocking factors; (2) avoidance; (3) poor communication; (4) intergroup jealousies and fears; (5) inflexibility or unwillingness to change plans; and (6) short time lines for implementation of plans.

Secrecy

How many of you work for school boards that meet in "executive session" to decide something that will affect children and that people might become upset about? An executive session may be necessary when personnel matters are going to be discussed. But when school districts are making decisions about how people's children are going to be instructed, it is really critical that those decisions be made in the open. The decision-making process in this area is absolutely critical, and people need to know where their elected representatives stand. Any board member who has to hide behind closed doors to say what his or her true feelings are about school desegregation or about bilingual education ought not to be holding public office. These are things we can change at election time.

Avoidance

In the area of school desegregation, avoidance means ignoring the real fears black parents have that their children are going to be discriminated against when they go into formerly all-white schools; that white parents have for their children's safety when they go into formerly all-black schools; that Hispanic parents may have when their children are assigned to schools in which their critical mass will be too small to qualify for an adequate program; that all poor parents have when they think they are going to lose Title I—the only thing they have ever had that paid any attention to poor children.

When such issues are avoided in a district, a real blocking can occur. Parents know that the district administrators are not dealing with reality. The reality of what goes on for minority and poor children, in this country, has had a lot to do with Title I in the past 15 to 20 years. I am not saying that Title I is perfect, or that Title I has made the great gains that at one time we thought it was going to make, or that Title I has even begun to compensate children for some of the losses they have suffered as a result of a basically elitist public school system.

Title I is the only program that was designed to provide poor children with anything, and it is very difficult to convince the parents that they will not be giving up something if in fact their children lose Title I. We know that despite Title I, and despite all the other compensatory programs, the schools that did not get Title I money—because they were too high in their income level and too white, or too low in many of the other factors to receive priority—those schools still manage to produce some pretty fair scholars, some excellent students as a matter of fact. Some parents are afraid that a child who has not had the benefit of enriched educational experiences may be harmed when he or she is placed in a totally desegregated

Title I is the only program that was designed to provide poor children with anything, and it is very difficult to convince the parents that they will not be giving up something if in fact their children lose Title I.

situation or a bilingual education program. Those fears have to be met. The school must devise a plan of action to meet those concerns.

Poor Communication

Some school districts have a hot line, or a fact line, on which parents can call and ask about the bilingual program, the desegregation program, or any other program that affects the children. I think this is a real "copout." Fact lines are necessary, but they are in no way sufficient.

Parents need to be told what the substance of the program is, what the purpose of the program is, and how it is going to be managed. In the case of bilingual education, parents want to know how it is going to be managed instructionally.

Do you mean you are going to be able to teach my child bilingually when the child is one of ten, as

opposed to one of two hundred? Do you mean that my child is going to get the same level of service? You have to be honest in terms of communications with parents on these issues. Parents need to know, for example, how long their child is going to be on a bus. If someone lies to them in the beginning, parents may never trust that person again.

So there is a real need for open communication with parents about the substance and nitty-gritty of what is going to happen. Many times the teacher does not know. It is a lot better to say, "I don't know; we are still working on it," than to tell them something that ends up being not true. In many school districts a lot of the hostile feeling has come from both minority and white communities—a feeling that school district employees have lied to them or told them something that was a half truth: "The ride will be only 45 minutes" or "The ride will be only 15 minutes." Well, the ride will be 15 minutes, but the child is going to be on

It is a lot better to say, "I don't know; we are still working on it," than to tell them something that ends up being not true.

the bus for an hour and a half. Those kinds of things happen all the time, and we have to see to it that they do not.

Intergroup Jealousies and Fears

Those of us who have worked in bilingual education and desegregation programs have got to do something to prevent intergroup jealousies and fears from growing. My personal feeling is that there are a lot of people who would love to see both desegregation and bilingual education go away, or who would love to see blacks and Chicanos kill each other off, because they really do not want to deal with either group. And the problems that school districts face with new refugee populations in this area are escalating.

One of the things we have to be very careful to do when we manage compensatory programs is to try to put a stop to the intergroup fear and mistrust that are endemic to those programs. "The blacks are getting more of the Title I money." "The Chicanos are getting all that bilingual money, and we do not have any for Black English." We have to stop this, we have to bring it out in the open, we have to talk about it, we have to negotiate solutions, and then we have to move on because there are some bigger battles that need to be won.

Inflexibility or Unwillingness to Change Plans

School administrators should be flexible and willing to change. Parents must have access to the decision makers early enough in the planning process, so that a plan can be changed without major disruptions. The planners should be willing to listen to the concerns parents or teachers might have about a program's effect on the children.

Insufficient Time to Implement Plans

School staff members just do not have much control over this factor. When court orders are issued and boards make decisions, school people have to move quickly. If a plan is to start in two weeks, then it is your job to make sure that it starts in two weeks. But when it happens in two weeks and the parents complain loudly, the teaching staff bears the responsibility.

Those are things that we have to work on, because, particularly in large school districts, nothing moves very fast. You certainly cannot rush and put together or dismantle plans for which it has taken years to try to gain the trust of people.

Now I am going to talk about factors that enhance one's ability to overcome poor attitudes. This is what helps, and this is the part I am really interested in. The first factor is open decision making. It is really important, as I said earlier, not to have a board that makes all its important decisions behind closed doors. The board has to have open doors at all times and not only at the board meeting. They have to be willing to provide as much information as is necessary before the board takes the final votes.

The second factor that we need to enhance our ability to overcome bad attitudes is clear descriptions of programs and of their impact on affected groups. One of the school districts I visited recently has a tremendous bilingual program for Hispanic youngsters, but now the district has many youngsters from Haiti,

The board has to have open doors at all times and not only at the board meeting.

Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. These children have been receiving only English immersion; however, because the Office for Civil Rights is concerned about the services these children are receiving, they now have an English-as-a-second-language program.

That school district did some pretty poor planning. It accepted federal money for refugees, but it did not provide the services those children needed. Further-

more, it did not commit itself to the planning that was needed in order to participate in the refugee program. Many excuses were given, such as, "We did not have enough time." "It is in fact not a written language, it is only a spoken language, so we cannot pedagogically design the same kind of program for the Creole children that we have for the Hispanic children." "We do not have anybody who speaks Creole."

There are all kinds of reasons why school districts cannot do things. The whole point, though, is that, unless in the area of both desegregation and bilingual education we are on target, both theoretically and operationally, about what it is we are trying to accomplish, it is going to be gone. It is pretty hard to defend a bilingual program for Hispanic students only if other students in the district have linguistic needs that are not being met. We also have to try to build some bridges to encourage intergroup cooperation and to try to break down the fears. We have seen that happen in some school districts where there has been open conflict between, for example, black and Hispanic students. We also have seen it happen in school districts where there has not been any open conflict.

Seattle, for example, has a tremendous diversity of groups, but some real attempts have been made to build intergroup networks that work together.

Adequate staff preparation and involvement are critical if these programs are to be successful. I have spent most of the past two years studying staff development and desegregated education in bilingual settings. The staff must be involved in the planning and delivery of the staff development. The staff includes the principal, but that does not mean the principal directs the development sessions. It means that the principal participates in terms of making the staff function as a team.

The staff must be involved in the planning and delivery of the staff development.

Another factor is the inclusion of community members in decisions about programs. Many people in the community feel alienated. The language-minority community may be afraid that participation in a bilingual program is going to mean that their children never learn English, perhaps because they were taught to speak English in school districts that did not let them get out of the first grade until they spoke nothing but English. Or they were taught in school districts that put them in an English immersion program and treated them in the most inhumane fashion or punished them when they spoke any language but English.

In many instances parents are concerned and sceptical about bilingual education because they had such harsh experiences as children themselves. Such parents need to be involved and brought to understand how the program itself is going to be shaped. They need to be informed about how children learn best in these settings. They need to be informed that studies have shown that children do seem to learn better without losing academically if they are taught to read first in the language they understand.

In many instances parents are concerned and sceptical about bilingual education because they had such harsh experiences as children themselves.

Finally, we need to solicit support from business leaders, elected officials, and influential people in the community. We need this for both desegregation and bilingual education. We need it for bilingual education because, until we do this, bilingual education is going to be regarded as a remedial program. Until we get the president of a major bank or a chief administrative officer of a large city to say, "I really need more people who speak more than one language because I am dealing with a city that is multilingual," until we get people like that to speak before our boards of education, bilingual education is going to be regarded as just another program to keep minority people quiet. It will never be regarded as anything that can be, is in fact, an enrichment program to provide children with the linguistic background that will enable them to cope with societies of the future.

We need to get people who have businesses and who are thinking about moving industry back into the cities to say, "I would like to see you desegregate the schools because I would like to be able to meet my affirmative action guidelines, and I have a hard time doing that because we do not have quality education in this school district for minority children." Until then, we are not going to be able to give priority to desegregation or bilingual education programs.

We need to get the people who are regarded as community leaders to make these statements before our governing boards, to help them to come into the twentieth century in terms of their own decision making.

WORK SESSION SIX

IT CAN HAPPEN

Teretta Terrell, Los Angeles Unified School District

We are going to talk about public education, about the legislation that mandates our bilingual program, and about organizing the school for a bilingual, multicultural approach. You are going to build together a model staff development program which will support a desegregated school involved in bilingual programs. We are going to talk about parent involvement and consider a human relations approach to leadership.

I am not convinced that every principal knows or has the skill to organize a school so that programs can be facilitated. We are now trying to help principals in building their instructional leadership skills.

Where are we in public education? The last ten years have seemed like a hundred years. Even in 1970 desegregation was not popular. For me to bring books like *The Authentic Child* or *The Culturally Deprived Child,* books on intergroup relations, racism, and so forth, would have horrified you. Remember? Remember the kinds of emotional issues that came up when we began the 3.3 classes and when teachers had to be involved with multicultural instruction? Remember the kinds of attitudes and emotional responses that were evoked by those things? We have been through the whole business of *Lau,* Title VII, and Title IX; we have come a long way with ESEA, Title I. In 1970 we were beginning the first parent involvement workshops for the 55 targeted Title I schools in Los Angeles. This was the first time we were encouraging parents to function in an informed manner in advising schools and so on.

I hope you in your districts are not taking ownership for everything bad that everybody has to say about public education. Personally, I have a very difficult time with lots of things because we have to begin to realize and think where the school's responsibility ends and where it begins. You cannot take ownership for everything that happens. The expectations are tremendous. Teachers think you ought to be doing one thing. Parents think you ought to be doing another thing. Hispanic parents think you ought to be doing something in particular, black parents think you ought to be doing something in particular, and all other kinds of folks in between have some different thoughts. Your boards of education are expecting some different things of you. Your friends expect other things. Principals and administrators expect another.

You know I felt that I really was going to have a very hard time with this conference because of its title and because of what has been happening to us in Los Angeles. I am trying to figure out where there is going to be a desegregated school or where we are going to be implementing bilingual bicultural programs. I think we are going to have to back up a little bit and interest, persuade, or cajole some schools, some principals, and some communities to want to see the benefits to all youngsters of a desegregated-integrated education. We do not have many districts in California that are participating in desegregated-integrated situations. Now if you know anything different from that, let us know. Large numbers of voluntary integration programs are going on in Portland, Oregon; Racine, Wisconsin; Dayton, Ohio; Baltimore, Maryland; and Omaha, Nebraska.

I have to say that, as emotionless as I try to be about the issue, when I found out on the radio that the Supreme Court was not going to hear a particular case, I remembered what George Wallace had said: "I draw the line in the dust and toss the gauntlet before the feet of tyranny, and I say, 'Segregation now, segregation tomorrow, and segregation forever.'" But pay no attention to that. That is strictly my emotionalism. The research does not bear out the benefits of the correlation between pupil achievement and any of the following: desegregation, class size, or teacher preparation. There is a correlation, however; there is no correlation between those things and pupil achievement, but there is a correlation between how youngsters feel about themselves, the self-image, and pupil achievement. So there are some things that I think we need to think about as we move into our work. Our job is to persuade parents, principals, and communities of the values of an integrated education.

Other Publications Available from the Department of Education

Approximately 500 publications are available from the California State Department of Education. Some of the more recent publications or those most widely used are the following:

American Indian Education Handbook (1982)	$3.50
Bilingual Program, Policy, and Assessment Issues (1980)	3.25
California Private School Directory	9.00
California Public School Directory	12.50
California Public Schools Selected Statistics	1.50
California School Accounting Manual (1981)	2.50
California Schools Beyond Serrano (1979)	.85
California's Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics (1980)	2.00
Curriculum Design for Parenthood Education (1982)	4.00
Discussion Guide for the California School Improvement Program (1978)	1.50*†
District Master Plan for School Improvement (1979)	1.50*
Education of Gifted and Talented Pupils (1979)	2.50
Establishing School Site Councils: The California School Improvement Program (1977)	1.50*†
Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools (1980)	2.50
Guide to School and Community Action (1981)	1.75
Guidelines and Procedures for Meeting the Specialized Health Care Needs of Students (1980)	2.50
Guidelines for Proficiency Tests (1982)	2.00
Guidelines for School-Based Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs (1981)	1.00
Handbook for Planning an Effective Mathematics Program (1982)	2.00*
Handbook for Planning an Effective Reading Program (1983)	1.50*
Handbook for Planning an Effective Writing Program (1983)	2.50*
History—Social Science Framework for California Public Schools (1981)	2.25
Improving the Human Environment of School (1979)	2.50
Martin Luther King, Jr., 1929—1968 (1983)	3.25
Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools, with 1980 Addendum (1982)	2.00
Monograph on Staff Development (1980)	1.50
New Era in Special Education: California's Master Plan in Action (1980)	2.00
Pedestrian Rules of the Road in California—Primary Edition (1980)	1.50
Physical Performance Test for California, Revised Edition (1982)	1.50
Planning for Multicultural Education as a Part of School Improvement (1979)	1.25*
Planning Handbook (1978)	1.50*
Proficiency Assessment in California: A Status Report (1980)	2.00
Proficiency Skill Development Kit (1980)	7.50
Putting It Together with Parents (1979)	.85†
Reading Framework for California Public Schools (1980)	1.75
Relationship Between Nutrition and Student Achievement, Behavior, and Health (1980)	4.00
Science Education for the 1980s (1982)	2.00*
Science Framework for California Public Schools (1978)	1.65
School Improvement: Making California Education Better (brochure) (1982)	NC*
Statement on Competencies in English and Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen (1982)	2.50
Student Achievement in California Schools	2.00
Students' Rights and Responsibilities Handbook (1980)	1.50†
Teaching About Sexually Transmitted Diseases (1980)	1.65
Toward More Human Schools (1981)	1.75
Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools (1982)	3.25

Orders should be directed to:

California State Department of Education
P.O. Box 271
Sacramento, CA 95802

Remittance or purchase order must accompany order. Purchase orders without checks are accepted only from government agencies in California. Sales tax should be added to all orders from California purchasers.

A complete list of publications available from the Department may be obtained by writing to the address listed above.

*Developed for implementation of School Improvement.
†Also available in Spanish at the price indicated.

75677-300 6-83 OSP 3M LDA

81-120 03-0382 300 5-83 3M